DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 102 95 CE 007 031

AUTHOR	Shook, Mollie W., Ed.; King, Sue J., Ed.
TITLE	Occupational Education, Vocational Education, Career Education--The Issues and Alternatives for Chief State School Officers: Dialogues with Chief State School Officers. Report of a National Invitational Conference for Chief State School Officers.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Dept. of Public Instruction, Raleigh.; North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh. Center for Occupational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	CVEP-R-12
BUREAU NO	02-2591
PUB DATE	74
GRANT	OEG-0-72-4676(725)
NOTE	79p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; *Career Education; *Conference Reports; *Educational Administration; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Educational Philosophy; Educational Policy; Educational Problems; Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; Policy Formation; Speeches; *State Officials; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Council of Chief State School Officers

ABSTRACT

Collected in the document are eight presentations which were made before a national invitational conference of Chief State School officers at Pinehurst, North Carolina, in April, 1974, taken directly from tapes of the conference. In his introduction, "The Quest for Unity and Understanding," John K. Coster enumerates conference goals: (1) to achieve fuller understanding of the great issues which confront vocational education; (2) to examine the system of education's goals, curriculum, personnel, and personnel development delivery system in light of the system's mission; and (3) to ask questions from which an indigenous philosophy of American education will eventually emerge. The speakers and the titles of their presentations are: Sidney P. Marland, "The Problem"; Albert Quie, "Governance, Legislation, and Budget"; Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr., "National Exceptations"; Willard Wirtz, "Alternatives for Action"; Terry Sanford, "Leadership for Education"; and John R. Ottina, "Implementation Steps: Where Do the Chiefs Go From Here?" A summary of the conference by John K. Coster concludes the document. Coster cites four points of concern emerging from the conference: a re-examination of American educational philosophy, and concerns for legislation, for bringing vocational education into the system's mainstream, and for developing State and Federal governments' partnership. Participant lists are appended. (Author/AJ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED122102

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, CAREER EDUCATION--

THE ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES FOR CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS:

DIALOGUES WITH CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Mollie W. Shook

Sue J. King

Editors

Report of a National Invitational Conference for
Chief State School Officers, Co-sponsored by the

CENTER FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
North Carolina State University at Raleigh

and the

NORTH CAROLINA STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Raleigh, North Carolina

****

The conference report contained herein is presented pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in conducting their projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

****

Career and Vocational Education Professional
Development Report No. 12

1974

Office of Career Education
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education
Project No. 04-2591
Grant No. OEG-0-72-4676(725)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE007031

THE CENTER

John K. Coster, Director

The Center for Occupational Education at North Carolina State University at Raleigh is a research and development center established in 1965 under the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The Center has been established as an integral unit within the School of Education at North Carolina State University, and its major programs are supported by contracts with the National Institute of Education. The Center has as its mission the provision—through research, development, and related activities—of a continuing contribution to the improvement of occupational education. The major research and development programs of the Center focus on the relationship of occupational education to its context or environment. The frame of reference for occupational education includes its relationship to regional economy, politics, and the employment or work environment. In addition to its primary programs, the Center also maintains a Division of Special Service Projects which provides the capability for flexible action within the Center's overall mission. Funding for these projects is not maintained through the Center's federal grant, but, rather, negotiated on a project-by-project basis with contracting agencies.

CAREER AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERIES

John K. Coster, Series Editor

This series is published by the Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, as a service of the Vocational Education Professional Development Unit, Division of Educational Systems Development, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U. S. Office of Education.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For additional information regarding the program of the Center, please write to:

Dr. John K. Coster, Director
Center for Occupational Education
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
P. O. Box 5096
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

PREFACE

The Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University, and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction are pleased to make these dialogues available. The presentations were made before a national invitational conference of Chief State School Officers at Pinehurst, North Carolina, in April, 1974, and were taken directly from tapes of the conference, not from formally prepared texts. The informal flavor of the presentations has been preserved, so far as possible.

The editors and the Center are indebted to the many persons whose efforts combined to make the Pinehurst conference a striking success, namely the conference planning committee, the program participants, the Center and State Department staffs, and, of course, the Chiefs themselves.

Mollie W. Shook
Conference Director

John K. Coster
Center Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION; THE QUEST FOR UNITY AND UNDERSTANDING - John K. Coster	3
THE PROBLEM - Sidney P. Marland, Jr.	7
GOVERNANCE, LEGISLATION, AND BUDGET - Albert Quie	19
NATIONAL EXPECTATIONS - Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr.	29
ALTERNATIVES FOR ACTION - Willard Wirtz	41
LEADERSHIP FOR EDUCATION - Terry Sanford	53
IMPLEMENTATION STEPS . . . WHERE DO THE CHIEFS GO FROM HERE? - John R. Ottina	61
THE HIDDEN AGENDA: A SUMMARY - John K. Coster	67
APPENDICES	
Appendix A. Statement by the Late Nelson Jack Edwards	69
Appendix B. Conference Planning Committee	73
Appendix C. List of Chief State School Officers	74
Appendix D. Program Participants	76
Appendix E. List of Observers	79

INTRODUCTION: THE QUEST FOR UNITY AND UNDERSTANDING

John K. Coster

This conference was held because the many unresolved issues in vocational education demand the resources of many persons to resolve them. When pared to the essentials, the issues of vocational education are those of education as a whole. Regardless of how the education system is defined, vocational education, or that part of education directed toward preparing persons for differentiated work roles, is a subsystem of that system. It is, thus, impossible to think of vocational education apart from education in its broader dimensions.

Vocational education is an aggregate of paradoxes. As an example, it is generally held that vocational education in America dates back to the founding of Harvard College, an institution dedicated to preparing persons for the ministry. Then, too, many persons believe the first vocational education act was the Morrill Act, which created a system of higher education designed to prepare persons for agricultural and industrial pursuits. If we were to establish a trajectory from these two points--the redoubtable Harvard and the powerful land-grant universities--at some point that line would intersect with the secondary school program to provide opportunities for youth and adults to prepare for occupations not requiring a bachelor's degree. This provision did occur through two nearly simultaneous events: the formulation of the famed Seven Cardinal Principles of Education as a philosophical embodiment of the scope of American public education and the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1917, which provided funds for part of the cost of established programs designed to fit persons for useful employment. The paradox, however, is that the term vocational education has applied to neither the training for the ministry, for which Harvard was founded, nor the training for occupations in agriculture and engineering, for which the land-grant college and universities were founded. Rather, vocational education applies solely to training for occupations which do not require a baccalaureate degree. Indeed, some would limit the term vocational education to the preparation for occupations requiring a high school education or less.

The Vocational Education Act of 1917 clearly put vocational education of less than college level under public supervision and control. But in the nearly 60 years since, vocational educators have complained vigorously that they are not accepted by the public school system, and many school administrators have complained that vocational educators do not want to be accepted. At the heart of the struggle are the millions of youth and adults whose needs for employment preparation are not being met, and this includes the majority of American citizens. There is evidence, however, that states are making great strides toward incorporating vocational education into the system, in fact as well as in name. Indeed, Craig Phillips' interest in this movement actually prompted this conference.

The decade of the sixties, when landmark federal educational acts were enacted, will go down in educational history. The two major vocational education acts were preceded by two distinguished documents: "Education for a Changing World of Work" and "Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work." The Honorable Martin Essex of Ohio, Dr. Rupert Evans of the University of Illinois, and Dr. Melvin Barlow of UCLA--all participants in this conference--took part in preparing these documents. These reports laid out the need to expand vocational education, not only in terms of occupations for which preparation is offered, but also in terms of the clientele to be served. Vocational education, as we have come to know it over the years, was intended to expand the services of the public educational system, but it has resisted its responsibility to provide educational services for all people. The clientele is to be extended to minority groups, the handicapped, the disadvantaged and any other person unable to participate in the educational fruits of the nation. While Congress has been adamant on this point, our record does not speak well for itself; yet the extension of vocational education to persons outside American education's mainstream is crucial to our very value system.

Vocational education, therefore, is a paradox in that it both imposes and is a victim of social stratification or, in less polite terms, snob appeal--a luxury it cannot afford. Equality of educational opportunity is a perennial issue, and, when it is resolved, each person will be assured the right to be prepared for one or more occupations by the public schools at public expense. Meanwhile, industry should not be expected to pay both taxes and the cost of training its own workers, nor should citizens be expected to pay taxes to support the public schools when those schools continue to produce graduates without salable skills. The American public has demonstrated that it will support public education to prepare persons for professional work roles in state colleges and universities; and, to an increasing extent, the public has demonstrated that it will support junior and community colleges, technical institutes, and area vocational schools to prepare persons for semi-professions and managerial, technical and highly skilled craftsman work roles. But the public has yet to demonstrate that it will support massive scale programs designed to prepare all students who will not continue education beyond high school for appropriate work roles.

The resolution of these paradoxes may need to await the development of an indigenous American philosophy of education. Perhaps the public's interests will best be served by an educational system based on an eclectic or "melting pot" philosophy. I for one, however, would like to think that ultimately we shall articulate our own clearly defined and internally consistent philosophy of education. Career education, a major issue confronting vocational or occupational education, is described as a concept or, more accurately, a philosophical entity. The educational ills which career education addresses are chiefly philosophical in nature, for they lie in such areas as the real value

of an individual's experiences and how these can be given meaning. Indeed, American education has inextricably moved toward a philosophical orientation to the individual, his acts, and the validity of his feelings and experiences.

America has always been considered to have a state-supported and state-directed system of education. The first vocational act supports this contention in that each state responds to the act within federal guidelines. However, vocational programs financed through federal legislation have had a strong federal orientation. Although it would not be entirely accurate to say that the chief state school officer has been ignored in developing and implementing vocational programs, it would be accurate to state that the manager in the state system has not been a full partner in the vocational education enterprise. Aside from purely practical considerations, impending developments in vocational education may result in changes in management and in the responsibilities of each level of management. The act which would have provided for revenue sharing did not pass in 1973 but may be enacted in the future. If this is done, the future of vocational education, as we have known it in the past, may be in the hands of the manager of the system of public education. The quest for unity and understanding may then mean the very survival of an educational system which, despite over half a century's growth, is not yet firmly embedded in the public schools.

At the conclusion of this conference, it is hoped that the following will have occurred:

1. Each participant will have achieved a fuller understanding of the great issues which confront vocational education.

2. Each participant will have examined the system of education's goals, curriculum, personnel, and personnel development delivery system in light of the mission of that system.

3. Each participant will have asked and will <u>continue</u> to ask questions from which an indigenous philosophy of American education will eventually emerge.

REFERENCES

Requests for more complete reference information should be addressed to each program participant.

THE PROBLEM

Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr.
President, College Entrance Examination Board

THE PROBLEM

Sidney P. Marland, Jr.

There are assembled in this room the essential parties to the formulation of a major benchmark in the history of American education during these next two days, if we choose to make it so--if we choose to believe that there is a central message around which we can gather to change this nation, change the life of the schools at all levels, and change the history of this country, particularly in its social dimensions. It depends, I believe, upon our will and upon the reasonableness of the propositions we examine, because I know of no Chief State School Officer who will not be concerned first with what is right for his schools, and with reasonableness in the things that he sets out to do as he leads his state.

I find this opportunity to be the opening speaker a dreadfully responsible one. I thought long and hard about the things I might say. Most of you have heard my rhetoric on the subject of occupational education. Therefore, I am shunning my own rhetoric and drawing heavily upon the current thinking and writing of others who have been examining the topic that we are examining today. I am going to draw from them quotations for your scrutiny, hopefully weaving them together in a way that will give us a profile of where we are in the educational history of this land. The responsibility of our schools and colleges to develop our citizens for occupational fulfillment has long been a high concern of education in America. There is nothing new about what we are addressing today, except that the opportunity for reform is larger, more urgent, and perhaps more possible. At no time in our history--as nearly as I can perceive it--has the occupational objective reached as high a place in our values as it holds today. A Gallup poll taken in August, 1973, revealed that 93 percent of the American people wanted their elementary and secondary schools to be concerned with the development of occupational competencies in young people. Ninty-three percent consensus on anything in any poll is remarkable, especially on something with as much reform implicit in it as what we are talking about today. There is a general feeling of discontent with things as they are in our elementary and secondary schools. Change is in the air. Students in our colleges too are demanding a different drum beat than what has been heard. Those of college age are opting--in some cases, out of college or not to go to college at all--quite irrespective of their intellectual capacities, because they are searching for other postsecondary experiences. This is distressing to our colleges. Students are voting by way of the registrar's office for what they want, and they are choosing pragmatically those things that will lead to more fulfilling lives--not only fundamental and purely occupational offerings, but offerings that relate to usefulness in subsequent careers.

For at least the last three years there has been a rallying of educational leadership around the theme of articulating occupational education with the cultural and academic learnings of our schools and colleges. This theme is called career education. The states appear to be the critical instruments of political, educational, and fiscal initiative in what increasing numbers of authorities view as a "reform movement" under the career education concept. This conference, as I perceive it, has as its purpose to assess the degree of consensus or difference that surrounds this subject and to examine the next steps. Such steps, presumably, will lead toward a program of action to be taken individually or collectively by states with federal encouragement and assistance. That consensus and plan for action could be the products of this meeting, provided there is, indeed, agreement on the validity and usefulness of the subject.

As we speak of the theme of the conference, I would use the term "occupational development" generically and not as a program--not as an educational concept, but rather as occupational development at large. I would use "vocational education" as a program--specific, legislative, and operational--contributing to occupational development. "Career education," as I perceive it, seeks a larger abstraction, elevating our concerns for occupational development to a harmonious and integrated system, giving equal value and dignity to work as we have traditionally given to intellectual development in our educational values. This is not a new notion. It was not invented in January, 1971, when the term "career education" seemed to find a certain amount of consensus and when we endeavored to speak a message from the federal government that had long been present in educational thought.

We speak of higher education and occupational purposes. Since its very founding in 1639, Harvard University has been an occupationally-oriented institution. The first 100 years of Harvard were devoted to the development of clergymen, in a career mode, blending and harmonizing the humanities, the social concerns of the day, and the science of theology with the pragmatic needs of a young nation to develop clergymen. Seventy-five percent of the graduates of Harvard during its first 100 years were clergymen. Benjamin Franklin, in 1759, developed the Philadelphia Academy as a place where young people could learn to work as well as learn their history, drama, and, as Franklin put it, "the underlying morality of the people." The Land Grant College Act was clearly aimed toward harmonizing formal academic learning with agriculture and engineering as early as 1839. So I am not speaking of anything new when I talk about the groping of our nation toward this ultimate abstraction that unifies preparation for work with preparation for the total development of human beings. Samuel Gompers, the great labor leader, addressing the NEA in 1916, pleaded for what he called the removal of the solely "bookish" needs of our schools, and for moving our schools toward something that would be useful in terms of the emerging industrial society, at the edge of which he stood.

Then came the landmark legislation of 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act. I call it a blessing and a curse for all ensuing years; a blessing because, of course, it was great legislation, setting in place the values of the American people on the need for developing human beings with occupational competencies. Yet, I say it was also a curse because in all these years there has been--by law, by custom, by protocol, by financing--a separate system. It was a force for good, because around it have rallied those concerned with the topic we are dealing with today; but it has been a nagging liability because of the statutorily encouraged separation. I told you that I was going to lean on others for thoughtful quotes, and I have drawn heavily in these remarks on David Rogers, who, in May of 1973, completed a very scholarly analysis of the emerging theme of career education. Rogers is a sociologist and professor of the School of Business Management, or Business Administration, at New York University. In the Teacher's College Record of May, 1973, Rogers said,

> There is a narrow and misplaced elitism that puts inordinate emphasis on a four-year college degree, gears most educational resources to college-bound students, insulates academic from vocational-technical training, and relegates students and educators in vocational programs to second-class citizenship.

This statement reflects national values and not just biases of educational separatists alone. One of the distinguished members of this meeting today, Martha Bachman, writes,

> Attitudes of vocational educators lean toward isolation and separation. This only succeeds in dividing the educational community. We should consider having vocational education compete on the basis of merit with all other instruction and stop referring to it as "that federal program."

Martha Bachman would probably bow to no one in her championship for the ideals underlying vocational education, but she notes the unhealthy separatism. Our faculties are separate, programs are separate, money is separate, and protocol and the rules and regulations governing certification are separate. I think that has been part of the curse. Vocational acts subsequent to the Smith-Hughes Act have gradually broadened and liberalized the very constraining and narrow legislation of 1917. They added new dimensions and opportunities for spreading from the high school level somewhat upward and provided for more course offerings than the narrowly defined trades. Even so, vocational education remained through 1968 as a separate instrument, funded at about $500 million a year of federal money and substantially larger parts of state money. I return again to Rogers:

> There is no effective delivery system growing out of this present mechanism. In brief, there is no orderly or effective

> system of occupational training and supportive services for all the youth in America--and none allowing for continuing interchange and movement between school and work. The many agencies involved do not function as if schools are producing young workers. No coherent delivery system exists involving collaborator relations among the many agencies concerned. This, along with the failure of the economy to generate enough jobs, has contributed substantially to the very serious problems of youth unemployment, alienation, crime, withdrawal, and other similar forms of behavior.

But then came the great legislation--the Education Amendments of '72--and the occupational components of that legislation. I am not going to belabor the details of that legislation except to say that you are familiar with it and it is all contained in Public Law 92-318. It hasn't yet begun to emerge in terms of being comprehended in its power, its scope, and its meaning for all of us who are concerned about education. The passages in that law clearly address the comprehensiveness which Craig Phillips in his opening remarks, asked us to think about today.

> The Secretary shall promote and encourage the coordination of programs developed hereunder, supported by all parts of the Vocational Education Act and other laws pertaining to education and the various departments and agencies of the federal government. . . . The Commissioner shall promote and encourage occupational preparation, counseling and guidance, job placement, and placement in postsecondary occupational education programs as a responsibility of elementary and secondary education. He shall utilize research and demonstration programs administered by him to assist in the development of new and improved instructional methods and technology across the board.

The law continues, giving totally new scope and flexibility to what has been vocational education's narrow authorities.

> There must be consideration of the most effective means for utilizing all <u>existing institutions</u> [emphasis added] within the State capable of providing the kinds of programs assisted under this part, including, but not limited to, private and proprietary institutions, technical institutes and manpower schools, branch institutions of state colleges and universities, and public and private colleges and universities.

There is nothing left that escapes the net of the comprehensiveness of this legislative authority, including

> . . . development of a long-range strategy for infusing occupational education--including general orientation, counseling, guidance and placement, either in a job or postsecondary occupational program--into the elementary and secondary schools on an equal footing with traditional academic education to the end that every child will leave secondary school prepared either to enter the productive employment field or to undertake additional education at the postsecondary level, but without being forced prematurely to make an irrevocable commitment to a particular education or occupational choice [emphasis added].

It's all there. There is no doubt about it's being law, so we have the authority to implement the career education theory. We do not need another line of law, in my judgment, to carry out the large implications of the comprehensive task that we are addressing today. I am going to run through very quickly some issues and obstacles that I hope will stimulate discussion. One is, "Where does the initiative lie?" In the States? In all of the several parts and territories, separately and individually, spontaneously? Or is there a coordinating mechanism? Is the federal role the supreme mechanism? I hope not, but there has to be an articulating of the leadership establishing more precisely the program, the delivery system, and the implementation, if something is to happen. There is no question, I think, in the minds of those of you who know me about the fundamental position I have held as a federal officer on the individuality and autonomy of states. Yet, I think that we have to ask, "Is the autonomy and diversity so complete that there is no room for the harmonizing among us that this meeting suggests?" So the issue is, "Where is the nexus of movement?" Is it state-by-state or is it in a consensus under a singular kind of leadership somewhere? If so, where?

The issue of definitions continues to rise now and then. Definition is part of the problem. I have counted at least 120 of them in the research that I have done, from such distinguished scholars as Ken Hoyt, Gordon Swanson and many others, including state legislators. Almost every state has some definition on which it is working. Some states have definitions built into laws now, and to me that is part of the beauty of it. The creativity and initiative that have generated pieces of comprehensive definitions--descriptors, program parameters defined--have been part of the beauty of what has been happening. I have felt that (as the architect's axiom says) "form follows function," and we haven't yet hammered out the function enough for the form to become exact and neatly defined. We have only been working at this two or three years, as you know. John Ottina has recently declared that in his role as Commissioner of Education, he now sees the need for the federal

side to begin to formulate a cleaner, sharper, and more rational definition. The time may well be for that. I respect John's judgment on it.

Another obstacle, or issue, that addresses this team is "the passing fad issue"--that if we just sit still long enough, the idea will go away. That seems to plague some of us, and I would ask you again to listen to David Rogers, who dismisses the likelihood that it will go away:

> It is a little early to make any summary judgments until it becomes apparent how career education programs work out. Far from being "just another fad," however, the career education movement (as enunciated in the recent literature-synthesizes many of the best reform ideas of the past decades from the various exemplary programs that have been tried out and proposes to apply them in a systematic way--not just to vocational schools but to the entire system of public education. A critical perspective on that strategy is certainly necessary but only after a close look at what the advocates are proposing and what their strategy is for implementation. In my judgment that much of the career education philosophy is in the right direction, although the limited commitment of federal funds to the program and its limited execution to date are disappointing.

Another issue is the industry/education relationship. I have held (and I think most of you do) that unless industry, labor, and the business community together--the places where people work--become completely articulated with this system so that there are opportunities for young people to take on the reality of work as a part of schooling, the ideas will never reach fulfillment. Hanburger and Wilson, two scholars in the manpower field, have written,

> Few strategies have yet been developed to promote more participation between industry and education. Nobody has yet developed explicit norms as to what the nature and extent of that participation might be, and educators are often very wary of having employers come in, lest they be unreasonably critical of existing programs and management and attempt to take over. Many negative stereotypes exist on both sides, with educators fearful of what one has called "creeping capitalism" and concern that industrialists might try to limit the curriculum to meet their own narrow manpower needs. Some employers on their side have tended to be insensitive and tactless in the past as they freely voice their criticism of the American schools.

Another issue that I would touch upon is the turfmanship question--the little rivalries, sometimes big rivalries, and jealousies that rest between our parts. At the local level, they exist between the vocational education professional staff and the academic staff--and even between vocational education and industrial arts staffs, in some cases. I have encountered in my own teaching and administration the turfmanship between the academic people of all levels and the so-called "utilitarian" people at all levels (whether it is high school or college); the turfmanship among federal agencies--Department of Labor manpower programs, Office of Education (who's getting "his" way?); and the turfmanship among agencies seeking money--O.E.D., D.O.D., D.O.L. The Department of Defense has an amazing occupational development program. Over a billion dollars a year of federal funds are going into the development of people in the military service. Last year they developed over 480,000 young people in various vocations--34,000 of them in paramedical fields, 63,000 electronic technicians, and 31,000 craftsmen in the basic trades. They are in this business too, and we must find some way, again, of harmonizing. Perhaps it may reside in the altogether reasonable propositions of this administration, that have had a fair amount of bipartisan support, called the Human Resources Department, a new cabinet-level agency combining education and manpower authorities, to bring together these parts that are now separated by "turf."

We come to the question of funding and the uneasy question that has been addressed, especially from the viewpoint of vocational education leaders--the "our money" question. "Our money is being used for development work in something other than vocational or technical education." Well, "our money," I suppose, is what Chief State School Officers and their associates choose to do with discretionary funds or such other funds in terms that the law allows. I think that the money question is going to continue to haunt us. If we are really serious and come out of the period that we are now in, there will be a time when very substantial sums of money will be requested and authorized in the education budget. It is time we the educators took the initiative to declare a national goal and fund it, instead of somebody else. If we as united school leaders go before the administration and Congress with a proposition and say, "This is going to cost a billion dollars the first year, two billion dollars the second year, three billion dollars the third year, and HERE IS WHAT IT CAN DO," with enough evidence from the models now in place (ane every state in one degree or another has begun to work at its model-building), I would predict a readiness of Congress to respond, with even larger enthusiasm than that applied to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We would have the advantage of a proven process that, hopefully, can be demonstrated to make sense as a major educational response. What are we talking about in money terms? A billion-dollar program will provide 20 million dollars per state. That gives you some idea of how the averages would work out. A billion and one-half dollars would allow $100,000 for every district, on the average, and you know that the average district is fairly small.

Five billion dollars would allow $100 per student, at all levels. That's five billion dollars against 15 billion dollars for welfare in the federal budget alone. I say let's turn that welfare money around into useful ends to create "whole people" as distinct from merely feeding, clothing, and housing people as they are, reproducing additional generations in the same mode. I know of nothing but education that can intercept that dreadful cycle, and that will cost money.

There is the anti-intellectual issue--those who say that things are either black or white. If you are FOR occupational education, you are AGAINST academic education. We in America seem to have an aptitude for making things black or white on almost any issue. We must be more determined to clear up this alleged dichotomy, telling those who care about this theme of comprehensiveness that the sum of the parts will be greater than what we now have in the separated occupational area and the academic area. I hold, with considerable conviction, that those college professors who are anxious about the anti-intellectual thrust that they see in this present movement, haven't done their homework on what it is all about. I hold that people coming into college will be far more highly motivated and have a far greater purpose in mind about why they are there than they now have.

Minority concerns are also an issue. Some minority viewers see this as another "put down" for blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Indians. I would have to say that those of you who have examined carefully the message of career education would agree with Larry Davenport, the former Chairman of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Davenport, who is black, says, "The career education movement brings more promise to minority children than any of the civil rights legislation so far enacted." Other thoughtful minority people who have cared to examine the message realize that it is not a form of tracking; it's a form of removing tracking so that every individual can advance according to his interests and capacities.

Coleman's thesis is that we are a society increasingly sheltering our young from the realities of work and what the world is all about. We are increasingly prolonging childhood. If you have not read his work, "Transition--Youth to Adulthood," I commend it to all leaders in education to help set our sights on where our society is pushing us. Coleman speaks harmoniously and supportively with us as educators and as a great social scientist himself. He sees career education as one of the lively options for response to his challenge.

There is the question of waiting for the research to come in; we can't wait forever. On the other hand, we have to watch out for the over-hasty implementation of new dimensions. We did that with Title I. In 1965, I, like everyone else in this room, was just as eager as I could be to get my hands on that added money--program or no program, research or no research, promising teaching procedures or no promising

teaching procedures. We wanted that money, and we got it and spent it, for the most part, for a continuation of all of the things that we had been doing. We did not substantially change the system. We cannot make that mistake again. The evidence must be in, and we have to decide when there is enough evidence and stop researching forever. The law authorizing the establishment of NIE makes a specific and concrete commitment to the development of strategies and models in career education. It is the only specific charge in the law. But each state, as well as NIE, has its own research and development. Both state and federal research and development must be articulated--and soon.

How should the training of teachers and the training of counselors come about? Those systems where it has been started have found teachers to be responding cordially, for the most part, to the new expectations that career education puts upon them. Counselors (and my work presently with the College Board does put me in touch a good bit with counselors) are asking with profound concern, "What shall I do as a counselor in this new mode that seems to be emerging all around me when all I have been doing is getting bright young girls into Vassar and bright young men into M.I.T.?" Now that is easy. We have been giving brownie points to our ablest counselors for doing the things that are easiest for them to do--not picking up the crippled, the limited, and the impoverished and creating a new life for them through counseling and new educational resources.

It's a new world for counselors, as well as teachers, and it must find a better system for balancing with our manpower needs. Unless we have a system in which the young people coming through our schools and colleges can find fulfillment in reasonable, decent work compatible with the things in which they have been counseled, we are going to end up with more and more bitterness. We must bring together some sort of symmetry to the development of human beings in compatibility with the needs of our nation. The art and science of manpower prediction are still miserably infantile, but we cannot settle for that--we are talking about new systems. This is not the responsibility of educators, but it is a large current social need.

Also, there is the issue of labor's concern with the emergence of new forms that introduce young people to the world of work realistically and the necessary and expected concern that labor expresses toward this mode. We ask that labor join, too, in looking for ways to contribute its wisdom to the development of more complete human beings through a synthesis of work and learning. I think it is well within the capacity of labor to join with us as a number of thoughtful labor thinkers have done in advancing career education. Walter Davis, speaking for the central educational office of the A.F.L., C.I.O., has been in on all of the deliberations surrounding the career education theme in the Office of Education. We have a distinguished labor leader,

Mr. Jack Edwards, here today who I hope will lend his wisdom to the work of labor, the feelings of labor, as we all move toward this emerging challenge to reconsider some of labor's present positions.

Finally, is there a need for reform at all? Or are we merely building "ghosts" here, saying that we should reform and then saying that as the road gets rough, we don't need to after all? That is something that nobody but individual leaders--local, state and federal--can decide for themselves. I close my remarks with a quotation from this booklet-something else that I warmly commend to you. It is a publication by the National School Public Relations Association that came out in January. It is a synthesis of all of the things that the staff at NSPRA have been able to discover about career education. It is an expertly researched, splendid piece of writing. It is very balanced; it brings in the critics and the negative side with all the worth and importance that it attributes to the affirmative side. And it comes out with a very thorough analysis in 72 pages, for those of us who have to read fast. I will close with a little passage at the end of this booklet:

> Is career education the new look in American education or something that will be in the history books twenty years from now as just one more of the fads that held the spotlight for awhile and then faded away? While it is problematical that anything as idealistic and all-encompassing as the total career education concept will ever be realized in its entirety nationwide, the evidence would seem to indicate that it is an idea whose time has come. It has its roots so deeply in some basic philosophical goals in American education and addresses itself to enough of the critical problems being experienced by the nation in this post-industrial era that it can scarcely be dismissed flippantly. In spite of the pitfalls, the criticisms, and continuing dialogue about how to define the concept and implement it, the evidence all points to a strong possibility that career education is the major redirection of the entire educational system.

Thank you.

GOVERNANCE, LEGISLATION, AND BUDGET

The Honorable Albert Quie
Member, U. S. House of Representatives from Minnesota

GOVERNANCE, LEGISLATION, AND BUDGET

Albert Quie

Since there is now such a growing awareness of occupational education and the need to achieve a skill during one's formal education on one hand, and to better understand the concept of career education on the other hand, I wonder if we need to use the word "vocational" anymore. Since career education is more all-encompassing than vocational education and since occupational education is more definitive than vocational education, the confusion of terms may be lessened by dropping one of the three, the one which seems to be encompassed by the other two.

Not only have new concepts and new ways of identifying them emerged, but there has also been a great change in education of the young people of late toward learning a skill during one's formal education. I have learned this by talking to high school students. I have made it a point to periodically visit each of the high schools in my congressional district and to respond to the questions of the students. I think high school students reflect the attitude of the rest of the population in their community in the way a thermometer indicates the temperature of the world surrounding it. You cannot blame the thermometer outside a window because it is cold or hot out there, but it tells you what to expect outside. You can talk to high school students and you can really find out what is going on in a community because they reflect what the adults are saying and thinking, and they don't hold back in their questions.

I have noticed as well that students are taking more interest in occupations and skills than they were a very few years ago. I have talked to students who are the product of colleges of the late '60's, who on a visit to their alma mater expressed unhappiness with the present students because they were spending all their time trying to get grades and to learn skills for an occupation. They were not storming the Dean's office or crusading for other concerns they had in the 1960's. The graduates did not think students were "with it" anymore. I noted that they are now the older generation and do not understand the younger generation. Students today more and more realize we have all become aware of the fact that vocational and technical schools are in great demand, while even lower-cost state colleges and junior colleges are worried about whether they are going to have adequate enrollment. There is a great desire now for young people to learn skills.

What is happening today has always been latent within mankind. When one reads about primitive tribes, the only thing different is the acquisition of skills came earlier in life. Formal education for everyone causes young people to remain adolescents in the eyes of others

longer than ever before in history. Consider the Indians in America. Before complete domination by the white man, they learned their skills as a warrior early (soon after puberty) in order to become known among their tribe as a person of value, which was a part of their culture. They learned occupational training and cultural development. That same thing existed among tribes in Africa before the white man ruined them. That is a natural part of the human being as he learns to live in an organized society.

I am convinced that we must reach the time when we feel that everyone who leaves his formal education should carry with him a skill for a job. Our problem, I think, is that so much of our education is to educate a person to be educated further. If you are only educating a person to go on to more school, it does not make so much difference if the school does a bad job; if it does not do a good job, there is somebody along the way later on to provide remediation, hopefully.

It amazes me that so many students who go to vocational/technical schools must have basic remedial education; in fact, some who go to junior colleges and four-year institutions must have remedial education as well. I think that every secondary school ought to feel the responsibility not only to push every academically-trained student on to post-secondary education, but also to see that everyone who does not so advance secures a job. It should be their responsibility to see that students are prepared for a job just as vo-tech schools or teacher training institutions do now. I have always been intrigued by school superintendents who could tell me how many of their graduating class the year before went to college. You ask them how many have got a job, and they haven't the foggiest idea.

We just heard Sid Marland say that a poll indicated that 93 percent of the parents felt that the education system ought to prepare students for an occupation. How many teachers feel that it is their responsibility? I recall once I spoke in New London, Connecticut, to about 250 teachers. I was supposed to talk on education for the '70's, and I told them that in the '70's I was convinced secondary schools would begin making certain that everybody learned the skills for a job. Laying out the career education concept beginning with elementary schools, I indicated that this should be felt by all teachers. After I finished, the moderator asked the group (something I have never seen a moderator do before), "How many of you feel a responsibility that your students learn an occupation?" Five hands went up. I made a mental note of where those people were and went over to them afterward. I found out they were all vocational educators. Then he asked, "How many think that within 10 years you will or should have that responsibility?" Twenty hands went up. The others evidently felt they should never have that responsibility. It's interesting that 93 percent of the parents think the education system should prepare students for an occupation, and only a small percentage of teachers thought they ought to do this. We have got some kind of a gap between educators and parents about which we ought to concern ourselves.

Let me tell you what I think the ingredients are for a good education. I think No. 1 has to be a well-qualified teacher. I know that you have all read Dr. James Coleman's excellent studies, which, in brief, said that the school facilities had no impact on the students, the teachers had little discernable impact, but what the students brought from home had the greatest significance. You get the impression that if only you let a student sit by another student who is more advantaged, then automatically something good will happen. I think he missed the point, which I believe to be true, that a well-trained, experienced teacher can make a significant impact on the achievement of students.

Second, and I believe equally important, as Coleman would imply, there is a necessity for parental involvement in the students' development, especially in the early years. We have seen a big change occur just in the time my children have gone to school in Montgomery County, Maryland, which has a reputation for having one of the best school systems in the country. I believed that when I moved there 16 years ago with the family. I realized after I had been there a while that it was the students who make it the best school system, because Montgomery County has the highest per capita income and the highest percentage of citizens with doctor's degrees. With students from such homes, even lousy teachers can have good results. That really isn't saying anything good about the education system, but some children were not doing as well, and our children were among them. So we asked the teachers if we shouldn't be helping our children with their homework and anything else we could do. They said just to leave it to them. We would get in the way if we interfered. Montgomery County has now done a 180-degree turn. With our last child, who is in the sixth grade, we find the schools encouraging the parents to assist in the educational development of their children.

The third ingredient is community involvement. I think we have ignored the community in public schools. I wonder how that happened. I have come to the conclusion in my own horseback theory on it that the community used to be really involved in education. I think that changed because we moved from the teacher who went to normal school to one who was certified and who had four years of college or more. As college graduates, we think back to those most enjoyable experiences in our lives. Undoubtedly, those four undergraduate years of college have to be the greatest we ever had--living with our own age group in isolation from the outside community. I think educators try to replicate that ivory tower experience in the school system.

We have learned, beginning with the studies of Head Start, that parent involvement is of the utmost importance to the development of the child in his early years. Now, sometime between when the child is held in the parents' arms, completely dependent on the parents, and when the son or daughter goes to college, completely on his own, students are learning how to be self-sufficient. Students do not become self-sufficient in the first grade, but they should be at the end of high school.

Where that change comes depends on the capacity of the children as they move along, but the community needs to be involved in that.

Now the community that the parents understand and feel and the community the children understand and feel is a very small community during the elementary years. As children progress in school where there is less need of parental involvement, there has to be more community involvement. The community of the school becomes larger as the student progresses into high school. We do not have the same community over all that once was existent in this country in rural and small towns where the students in school could see what their parents were doing and what their neighbors were doing. The jobs that the adults were involved with were conducted around them. Now many young people live in parts of the city where there is no industry or business going on. There are some grocery stores and retail outlets they can reach, but in some of the ghettos of the city, even that hardly exists. That old neighborhood store does not exist. After the riots in Washington, they closed drug stores and grocery stores in ghettos because of the unrest that existed in parts of the city for a period of time. Young people in those areas do not even have a chance to see the drug store or grocery store in operation around them.

We now need to give young people an artificial opportunity for work experience. I think we have already waited too long. Our laws are written to prohibit young people from having that experience. Child labor laws are preventing them. So now we need to develop it artificially within our schools. We have seen programs work well when young people have a chance to spend time in some business and watch how the adults operate. I remember reading that a Detroit newspaper had twelve-year-olds come to spend some time with them. At first, there was concern with what they would do with those twelve-year-olds, but those newspaper people said after the experience as they looked out on the lights of the city, it was not just a faceless city, but a city full of the families of those children they had come to know. They knew that those students had a better understanding of how a newspaper operated having spent some time with them. That is the kind of work experience we need replicated all over.

Just think of the occupations of people you know. So many people work in establishments where they must have a name tag with a number and picture on it and must be checked in before they can go to work each morning. Kids cannot go along with dad or mother and watch how they work. Also, so much of our work is done behind a desk. Little children cannot really tell what we are doing behind a desk. So the opportunity for work experience must be an educational ingredient.

The whole question of the ability to assimilate the development of skills into one's culture is an ingredient. I talked recently to a person who is teaching this year for the first time--teaching seventh grade. Some kids in that seventh grade cannot read, so she tries to

figure out how she can reach them. However, she did not learn those skills in college, and around her she does not have the supportive activity so she can spend extra time with those students or help them to read. So there is a frustrated first-year teacher, unhappy because many seventh-graders can't read.

I am really intrigued by people in education who object when I suggest to them that we must teach pupils to handle their reading and math because if they will do that well, they can even educate themselves. (If they cannot read and handle their math, they must be a genious even to be educated in a formal way.) I am told there are other things that are more important in school. What is more important than reading and math? We have proved through the Job Corps that individuals who could not read when they got into the Job Corps learned to read through techniques which were developed. They should have been able to learn to read through those techniques earlier.

Schools, of course, do provide more opportunity for students than the basics. In fact, the mastering of the basics helps in the whole area of human relations. Human relations is like puberty; there is no way someone can go through it for you; you must do it yourself. It is the same with learning to deal and relate with other human beings. There is nobody who can do it for you. It's experimental. Exhortation by itself is not going to do it. Career education provides the optimum opportunity for capable human beings leaving our schools.

Lastly, we are talking, also, about life-long learning--the idea of people going back into job-training again or retraining in any of the academic subjects. There is talk now of lowering the number of compulsory education years and permitting young people to drop out of school for a period of time before they finish high school. I think all of that is healthy because when you observe anyone who goes back to school after a work break, he works much harder at it, and it becomes much easier for him because of the work experience he has had. I think that, too, can be a part of our whole education program.

Now, what part should the federal government play in this? I believe as it develops legislation, it ought to enhance these ingredients--expand the opportunities for teachers to learn skills that they did not have to learn when they were going through a teacher training institution; make certain that parental involvement and community involvement are encouraged; enhance the chance for work experience and the development of good relations; and ensure that there be continuing opportunity for persons to avail themselves of education programs.

If, then, the federal government is going to assume particular responsibility in any part of education, I think there are three areas where it has not fulfilled its job adequately. One is limited assistance

for special education for the handicapped. The second is compensatory education for the disadvantaged child. We have done much better on that--$1,720,000 this year and the administration has requested $1,885,000 for next year. I believe the House bill H.R. 69 is a good step forward. However, I am convinced that we ought to get away from distributing the money based on low income so that we can figure out how to make compensatory education available to anyone who is educationally disadvantaged, no matter what his parents' income.

The third area, I believe, is occupational training. Now we have legislation for postsecondary vocational education occupational training. We have legislation on the books which could be of assistance in career education, but we still have not effectively provided the incentive for everyone who will leave formal education in the secondary school to leave with a skill. I find a reluctance among some vocational educators concerning whether that is their responsibility. Some feel that vocational education at the secondary level ought to be preparing students for vocational education at the postsecondary level. They are not all in agreement with teaching students skills in high school. I am glad that career education is a concept rather than a program. Otherwise, I am afraid the federal government would define it very precisely and reduce state and local flexibility. I like the idea of a concept, and I am glad that Sid Marland, even though he says many times that he is not the father of career education, has articulated career education as a concept. I am glad it is still a concept that we can be talking about now, because then the vision and imagination can continue until all schools can do something about it.

As the federal government helps in these three areas, let me point out how I think they ought to assist in total education. Foremost in importance is research. The federal government should be spending money on research in education in amounts similar to those for defense, health, and agriculture. Those are three areas where the federal government has done an outstanding job in funding research. The percentage of the total ought to be the same for education as for those three areas. We need research because it seems to me so much change in education comes from "fadism" rather than from a well-studied determination of validity. I think that insufficient research has been the reason. We need demonstration projects, innovation programs and training programs.

To the extent that we provide service money, I believe it ought to follow what is now called special revenue-sharing. It gives the greatest amount of flexibility possible to the local schools because there is neither the intelligence nor the energy in Washington to be able to wisely distribute money to the local school districts so that it reaches the right child.

The one thing the federal government has not developed an adequate model for, as yet, is evaluation. We have done a poor job there. It was interesting, three years ago, that I really could not find in Title I of ESEA whether the schools were actually helping the students to achieve or not. In the last three years we have been able to obtain some information showing good results, but it is very difficult to get uniform information from all over the country. There was fear some years ago of a national assessment in which the federal government would be dominating the field. There was worry that the federal government would provide the standards by which to evaluate, and as a result control, education. We need to learn more about what actually is is happening through a better evaluation system. To date, I do not think we have that.

As the federal government moves forward, I believe it should not compartmentalize itself as much as it has. I have long favored a cabinet-level Department of Education and Manpower. The purpose would be to wed those two areas together, because that is what we are about--occupational training and cultural development together as one. If you put manpower programs and training off to one side, you are leaving out other components of a person's development. This administration talks about a Department of Human Resources in which there would be an Office of Education and Manpower. No matter how we end up, I believe education and manpower ought to be together so there is constant cross-fertilization of ideas between the academic educator and the one who provides the occupational training.

There needs to be a delivery system of new, innovative ideas so that we get away from the fadism, not only through adequate research but also by bringing facts to the local schools. The best model that I ever saw is that which operates in agriculture--the county agent system--whereby the research that is conducted in the land-grant colleges, federal research stations, and elsewhere actually gets to the farmer. I think a system of that nature can be developed with the federal government assisting, but it cannot be totally federally funded. The agent must be partially paid by local funds so that the local school district does not feel threatened by an individual made available with federal funds.

Let's look at some of the problems that we have in working with new legislation. I have an example of the difficulty we had in vocational education and how long it takes to accept new ideas. I recall when President Kennedy recommended that we ought to remove the four categories of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and that we should not earmark money specifically for vocational agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and distributive education. The Republicans supported it, but he could not put it through the Congress. Now, Lowell Burkett's predecessor was in favor of the Kennedy proposal

but he could not recommend it because his constituency would not permit it. So in 1963 we expanded vocational education assistance, but those four categories remained intact with the amount of money they had to keep their security. Security seems to be awfully important in education.

It was not until 1968 that experience with non-earmarked new money made people in three of the four categories realize they did not need that security of earmarking. I think those of us in Washington ought to recognize that one of the reasons why even this was possible is that additional federal money was made available. I would suggest further consolidation of vocational education and more money put into the pot so that any competition will be over additional funds.

But money is really an important factor. I thought it might be just the members of Congress who wanted to make sure they brought home the bacon to their districts so they could get elected again, but I find educators are more jealous for money than even the Congressmen are. Jack Edwards this morning mentioned that one Congressman from his state offered an amendment to H. R. 69 which would distribute 2/3 of the money based on the number of school children and then 1/3 according to the formula we have in the bill. It's interesting that 284 members of Congress would have received more money in their congressional district if that amendment had passed, but he got only 103 votes for his amendment. Now that must mean that there were about 181 statesmen and 103 politicians out of the 284 who would have gained. Why was it that 181 voted against more money for their congressional district? They evidently thought the committee formula was more fair nationally.

One of the reasons was the rule under which H. R. 69 was debated which gave the members time to study the amendments. Now, I fear that if we had brought that bill out of general debate and gone immediately into the amendment stage, the amendment mentioned would have passed, because members told me when they heard about it, "I'm going to vote for that one since it provides more money in my district." Yet they had a chance to study and realize it was children who were disadvantaged who needed help, not congressmen. Our Committee started that way, working on the formula. First, members talked about how their congressional districts and their states could get more money. They finally were convinced to back off and take a look at it to decide what was the best and most fair program for all children in need under the circumstances. We then derived the formula in H. R. 69. It took us more than a year to do it. It is interesting, during that time, the number of times Chairman Perkins said to groups of educators, big city school superintendents and others, "You sit down and work this out for us, and then we will vote on it." They sat down, but they never could agree because they were more interested in getting money for their school districts than they were in looking at the overall picture of providing the best education for the most needy young people of the country. It

is interesting that the people who talk to us about how important the low-income child is and how we ought to make money available for the low-income child seemed to forget about that high principle in favor of any amendment which put more money into their school district. Now, you can expect congressmen to react that way, but why do school superintendents react that way? They are supposed to look to the best interests of education, but I think we ought to be aware that all are human and money is important. I really have to take my hat off to my colleagues who voted down the amendment to H. R. 69.

Let me now talk about those of you gathered here. When I first came to Congress, the Chief State School Officers had very little political clout. Most members of Congress did not think you were a very capable group of people. That has changed now. The Chiefs are looked at with respect, and the states are looked at with much more respect than they ever were. New respect for state and local officials is evident in the recently passed Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, by which money will be distributed to prime sponsors who were in political subdivisions of over a 100,000 population, and the state will be the prime sponsor for the remainder of the state's communities. This shows confidence in people in political life at the state and local levels that did not exist a decade ago. Now the same thing is true, I believe, of the Chief State School Officers.

If we are going to have an adequate delivery system, I think we ought to deal from the federal government, through the states, to the local school districts. Now John Ottina is not going to be very happy with me for what I say next, but I do not think regional offices are really an adequate step between the two. In fact, I think a regional office should exist only to provide the technical assistance that a state needs on a coutinuing basis. I think it would not be difficult for John Ottina to deal directly with the 50 states and territories. I listen to the proposals on regional offices and I am not convinced. I am convinced that we have a system within our entire nation where you can develop an ability to speak in a voice. I think we need a federation of states. I do not think that the federal government can speak for the nation's education. I think that education ought to be speaking to Washington and to the Congress, and education has not done a good job to date. Educators did not help much in writing the Education Amendments of 1972. Elementary and secondary educators did help a little in the writing of H. R. 69.

I hope that as we move ahead in occupational education, we will give time for national debate to go on and educators' input to be made. I am glad for having this conference and being able to be here because here are the chiefs of a good majority of the states sitting around and talking about what we should be doing next in occupation education and career education. I look forward to what you finally decide at the end of your session and to what you do next, because you are a group of people to whom we must listen if we are going to write adequate legislation in the area of occupational education.

NATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr.
Vice President
Southeastern Region of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce

NATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr.

The title of our session this morning is "National Expectations." Now, that is a pretty big mouthful to chew up in two and one-half hours, so I will not attempt to cover the whole field. We have an able group of catalysts who can speak to many other areas of particular interest, so I shall limit my remarks to the viewpoint of the business community, which, while an important one, is by no means the only section of interest in the topic "Occupational Education, Career Education, and Vocational Education."

The native Virginian talking about education back home is supposed to invoke Tom Jefferson, who was mainly responsible for, among many other things, the system of public education begun in Virginia and "borrowed" by many other parts of the country. I have heard what I think is a pretty good story about an off-shoot of one of Thomas Jefferson's great works. It has to do with a young student who was asked by his teacher, "Johnny, who wrote the Declaration of Independence?" Johnny replied, "Damned if I know, teacher." Now, this was back a few years ago, and this was a proper, old-fashioned lady. She thought that was very out of order, and she sent the boy home. His parents were naturally a little concerned about this. They were good God-fearing folks, although not particularly well educated themselves, and they believed in bringing up their children right. So Johnny's father took him back to school the next day and asked the teacher why she had sent Johnny home. "Well," she said, "when I asked Johnny a simple question about who wrote the Declaration of Independence, he said, 'damned if I know.' I don't allow that in my classroom." Johnny's father thought a minute and then said, "Johnny, you know I've always tried to bring you up right, to tell the truth, and to do the right thing. Now, son, if you wrote that damned Declaration of Independence, you tell the teacher right now."

I feel a little humble in the presence of so much educational talent and leadership. The ladies and gentlemen sitting around this table have a great deal to do with where education in this country goes, and, as a layman and one who is only peripherally interested in education, I feel some hesitancy in talking frankly with you here today about some of the problems that perhaps we jointly share. I welcome the opportunity, though, to share these thoughts with you on how business views the state of education today and on changes that we suggest are necessary if our youth are to be served better by their educational experience. I should mention first that I cannot presume to speak for all businessmen; this is a large segment of our country. The National Chamber of Commerce is a federation of business organizations composed

of roughly 2,700 local and state Chambers of Commerce, trade associations, and other business organizations with somewhat related interests. Sometimes we can differ very decidedly among ourselves. As a federation we have adopted a policy which is acceptable to the main body of that constituency.

As far as the subject of our conference here is concerned, the National Chamber has gone on record as being very wholeheartedly in favor of career education. Although I was interested to hear your discussion here yesterday about the fact that the definition--a very precise definition at any rate--seems to be still missing at this point, we support career education as we understand it. Now, small employers can look on this matter of the demand for a wide range of skills very differently from larger, more nationally known companies. After almost seven years as a director of the National Chamber and as chairman of various Chamber committees including one on education and manpower, I have come to some candid conclusions in the matter of education, based particularly on a survey of education in the country which the education committee made about two years ago. These committee findings were complimentary in that we learned that our schools are doing a better job than ever before. They were critical, though, in that the schools' job still is not good enough when measured against daily rising expectations.

We are all acutely aware that the American citizens demand more from all of our institutions in the 1970's than at any previous time. With respect to business, numerous public opinion polls point forcefully to the extent of public disenchantment with the President, Congress, the business world as an institution, our churches, and our schools. A recent survey indicates that the number of persons with a great deal of confidence in business has dropped more than 50 percent in the last seven years. Aside from the merits of certain criticisms, a major reason business has declined in public esteem is that society has changed its rules and expectations. Just take one example. There is no question that automobiles today are much safer than they were 10 or 20 years ago. Yet, Detroit has been subject to scathing criticism, and properly so, for producing unsafe cars. New rules are now enforced, though, and product quality that was accepted in the past is no longer acceptable today.

The rules have similarly changed for career education, which, by the way, has also declined drastically in public esteem. Let's consider a philosophy that our schools educate all of our students. Now, some members of the chiefs yesterday indicated that the job is perhaps being done better than some of us outside education appreciate, and I would certainly agree with that premise. Perhaps in years gone by it was an implied obligation for our public school system, but there seems to be ample evidence that society then didn't really expect equal-handed, quality education to be available to <u>all</u> of our citizens.

about the 900,000 annual dropouts and non-achievers; but 20 years ago we ignored the fact that nearly the same number were dropping out. While the school enrollment in the meantime has risen steadily, the dropout rate has actually declined almost in half--from 41 percent to 22 percent, I believe, at this time. The actual numbers have gone up slightly in view of the increase in school population which is in line with the national population growth. Why the clamor today about dropouts? Why aren't our schools being applauded for making a much improved performance? The answer, as you state school heads know better than I, is that the standards for performance have changed. Why were we so much less concerned about dropouts in the 1950's? Primarily because at that time there were many more low-level, unskilled jobs to fill, and the functional illiterate was considered "better" suited than the high school graduate to fill them. In 1930 approximately 30 percent of all jobs in the country were unskilled or required few skills other than a willingness to work and do what one was told. Today such jobs represent less than four percent of our national job market. In support of this statement I offer these statistics. Unemployment for youth 16 to 20 years of age averaged less than ten percent from 1947 to 1953. Twenty years later, during the period from 1967 to 1973, this rate skyrocketed to over 14 percent, a 40 percent increase. This increase occurred despite the fact that a much higher proportion of students were staying in school and, therefore, not going into the job market. One of our catalysts yesterday referred to a major problem that minority youth have in getting jobs today. It's a fact that our national unemployment rate is 5.2 percent at this time. The unemployment among youth in general is double that national rate, and the unemployment among minority youth in cities is double that, so the problems come home very quickly to this group of young people who do have to get out of school for one reason or another and seek a job. Granted that many other variables are involved, the primary reason for idleness among youth today is that the traditional, long-time bottom rungs have been chopped off the job ladder. Only about four percent of our 86 million jobs are now classified as unskilled, and the skill demands for the remaining jobs continually advance. Yet, as previous speakers have noted, most of those who graduate in general high school curricula or who do begin but do not finish college have qualifications of little classical value for many employers.

This brings us to the specific question that we were asked to address this morning. What is business expecting and asking of the schools? Business asks the schools to respond to the realities confronting today's students and today's employers by keeping pace with the rapidity of change in our increasingly complicated and highly technical society. We ask our schools to include parents and business-industry-labor groups in the formulation of educational policy. We ask our schools to serve effectively the majority of their students. Eight of every ten secondary school students will never go to college. We ask our teachers and administrators to serve them with the same pride

as they serve the minority, the two out of ten students who will seek a college degree and the one out of ten who actually gets the degree. We ask our schools to give more attention to providing learning opportunities outside the present structure of formal education so that students will be less isolated from the world they will enter when they leave school, with or without a high school diploma. Finally, we ask our schools to be accountable for our student results: to focus on preparing them to find their place in the world of almost unlimited career opportunities or to pursue further training at the community college, baccalaureate degree, or graduate school levels of higher education. I think that one of the main opportunities and challenges of the career education or occupational education concept is the fact that today, as I understand it, vocational education enrolls approximately 20-25 percent of the nation's school children. That is fine, but that leaves 75-80 percent of our students who do not have that contact with a practical preparation for whatever they are going to do. That is not limited to only business careers, either. Professional careers, agri-business careers, and many types of opportunities that our youngsters have today to go on to something rewarding to them and to society need to be much more closely tied in with what the youngsters do in school. We urge you leaders in education to focus on what you prepare students to do in later life rather than perhaps putting quite so much emphasis on educational factors--such as tax dollars spent, books in the school libraries, number of students per teacher, and teacher salary scales--important as all these things are in a great enterprise like public education in the United States. In other words, let's devise fair and realistic measurements of school outputs in human terms as contrasted with what appears to have been a major reliance in the past on input factors of a statistical nature. I realize you cannot run a school system without money, and it was interesting to hear some of the comments and questions yesterday of Congressman Quie, who, of course, has a very close connection with a source of funds. But we must be practical at the same time, and I think you can have adequate funding, and perhaps even greater funding, if some of these needs for education are met.

Perhaps you feel that I am being unfair. I would like to remind you of the definition of a friend. A friend is someone who knows you well and still likes you. He knows your shortcomings as well as your good points. As a friend of education, I know many good points about it, but I call your attention to some places where perhaps we can jointly improve its performance. In connection with this last expectation, I am reminded of a recent newspaper article describing a law suit for $1 million against the San Francisco, California, school system. Although the student in question had an above-average I.Q., according to tests he was still a functional illiterate. He could not read when he was graduated from high school. In this suit, his parents contended that their son was graduated "unqualified for employment other than the most demeaning, unskilled, low-paid manual labor."

Assuming the average cost of $1,000 per year to educate this young man, the taxpayers of San Francisco had put out $12,000 over the 12 years of his school career. For various reasons they had failed to carry out the assignment of the contract, so to speak, in educating him. Even more important, this young man had been short-changed as well as had the taxpayers.

I realize it is difficult to satisfy everybody, and that reminds me of a homely little story about a young man in the old days who got out of school and decided to get married. He met a nice girl he liked, and at that time it was proper to bring your girl home to meet your parents before you got married. Well, he brought this one home, and it was fine with his father but she didn't do much for his mother. He tried that several times, but none of them was ever good enough. Finally, he got the picture and took one home who was just like his mother--and then his father refused. I realize it is easy to be critical of other people's problems. I am sure that it is unimaginably difficult to teach knowledge and skills to many of the so-called disadvantaged students and even to many of those with no intellectual handicaps. My own son is 16 now and has a little problem of motivation and the desire to play the scholastic role to its proper conclusion, so it hits pretty close to home. It is not something that is intangible and happens only to somebody else. Students inevitably bring some of the ills of the society into the classroom. Society now justifiably demands that the school system teach every educable child regardless of language barriers, cultural differences, and distractions of the neighborhood and home. The mere financial burdens to the public treasury of failing to educate the students to hold worthwhile jobs are overwhelming. On the average, we invest $1,000 annually in each student's school program, but I call your attention to the fact that it costs an average of $11,000 annually to maintain in a public institution anyone who proves incapable of becoming a productive and law-abiding citizen. In other words, institutional costs are 11 times as great today. They will probably go up in the future. The annual costs of welfare and unemployment compensation are probably greater than the $1,000 for schools.

Teachers and administrators can't have it both ways; they can't ask for the respect and salary of a skilled professional while shunning the responsibility for teaching all but the easy learners, if you will. Of course, nationally most teachers and administrators don't shun that responsibility. I was impressed with a recent statement by William Coats, State Superintendent, in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Mr. Coats said,

> Our students will have adequate skills when they are handed Kalamazoo diplomas. To keep that promise we must carve out the components of student growth for which we can and will accept responsibility, and we must quit using the cop-out

that schools aren't able to help kids from bad homes anyway, so it is not fair to hold teachers and administrators accountable for student achievement.

That's a school man who doesn't normally boast, and I assume he is a career educator. It is in the context of teaching for results that we believe career education offers every promise of success. Career education, in the view of many businessmen, offers two big advantages to any school system. First, it gives students a greater incentive and motivation to learn because they are shown how to relate their academic pursuits to their future practical application. Second, career education makes available to schools a largely untapped and extensive reservoir of community resources, not only in business but in the whole spectrum of job opportunities open to our youngsters today. The possibilities include things that 25 years ago weren't even dreamed of as being possible for the average citizen. The variety of careers and subtle misconceptions about them are illustrated by a little story that I heard about a first-grader who took a test which involved, among other things, two drawings, one of a man reading and the other of a man chopping down a tree. She was asked to circle the picture of the man who was working. This little girl circled the man reading. The teacher marked the answer wrong. Well, it so happened that her own father was a school teacher, and when she saw him reading he was working, and when he was out chopping trees he was doing that for relaxation. So careers can have many types, and they encompass a wide variety of opportunities.

Let's consider some facts about the careers that are open today. Today there are 23,000 different types of jobs, according to the Department of Labor, and by 1980 it is estimated that this will grow to 30,000. The number of new jobs will, of course, be much greater than the 7,000 indicated by this difference in figures. Many jobs at which people are working today will decline to the point that they will have little significance in the labor market even at the end of this decade. In fact, of the millions of youngsters who started kindergarten and first grade last fall, two out of every three of them will eventually hold jobs that don't exist today. In other words, by 1985 we will have that much of a turn-over in our labor market or job market. So the questions yesterday regarding school responsibility for placement of students in jobs is highly relevant and, as we see it, essential if the schools are going to perform their maximum possible service to the community.

How can the schools prepare their students effectively for this very rapidly changing job market? Obviously, school adminstrators and teachers can't do it alone. It's a rare school adminstrator, guidance counselor, or teacher who has been outside the field of education, and I say this in no critical way. Consequently, educators' knowledge of what employers want and need must come from the employers, professional

labor groups, and others who know what the career involves. Businessmen and educators must get together on a continuing basis to plan and update the curricula in light of actual and future job demands and must consider changes necessary to help to bring young people successfully through this critical transition from the world of education to the world of work.

This gives rise to an obvious question: assuming there is agreement on the part of the school people and the business and professional labor groups that a major goal of education is to prepare students to select wisely and advance in their careers, what are the best procedures for establishing the school-business partnership? At the Chamber we have been giving this matter much thought, because, without an active and continuing collaboration between educators and businessmen and professional people, no program of career education can really come alive. As we have pointed out, career opportunities change; and to keep up with the real world, those currently engaged in the many types of careers and their changing requirements must keep closely in touch with the schools if we are to prepare the youngsters for effective participation. The real crux of this matter comes in how we get this cooperative venture off the ground. As a practical matter, the average businessman rarely takes the first step in matters of education. This is primarily because he recognizes the teaching and administration of the school system as highly professional activities in which he is not particularly well trained, if at all. He is, therefore, reluctant to presume to suggest aids in improving the structural procedures and particularly to lead in innovation of an entirely new concept such as career education. Furthermore, the average businessman is pressed for time and beset with an array of problems of his own in regard to his business. However, there is ample evidence that, if invited under the proper auspices by school officials to work in a cooperative effort, a typical business executive will readily respond. Scores of local Chambers of the 2,700 nationwide have actively assumed leadership in such efforts through their education committees. Many more are yet to get started. I am delighted to hear from Dr. Pittenger of Pennsylvania that the Chambers in his State have taken some very good steps in this direction. Dallas, Texas', local Chamber has been a leader in a great change in the school district there and in the development of the Skyline Career Center. I merely cite these as two examples because there are others all over the country. One of the main reasons some businessmen hesitate is their lack of expertise and knowledge of the educational process in general and, in particular, what the career education concept actually is and what it offers to our students and teachers. In other words, the fact that you leaders in education know what career education or occupational education is does not mean that the public generally does or that the business community does. This means that educational leaders like yourselves

and knowledgeable business professional leaders have a joint responsibility, and I emphasize the word joint, to inform and motivate school leaders and business professional men throughout the country to get on this career education band wagon. The widespread interest in career education that has already been brought about by the very effective work of Dr. Marland, Dr. Hoyt, and others must be amplified and expanded. Actually, there is much wider knowledge among professional educators about what this is all leading up to than there is in the business community. We hope that you, the members of this very influential audience, will carry a torch for career education in your own states, seeking opportunities to present the facts and challenges to various leadership groups there and pointing out how they can participate on a continuing basis if this program is, in fact, to be successful. The National Chamber is working in two major ways to achieve wider recognition and support for the concept. We are developing a program for publicizing career education and for enlisting continuing support in the business community. We plan to have a speakers' bureau with volunteer members from among local, state, and national Chambers--men and women qualified to speak on the subject to educators, businessmen, and other groups. To support their efforts, the Chamber will develop and distribute brochures on the economic and social benefits of career education and why business must take an interest in and provide more effective support for our schools in this major effort.

Our second major project is directed toward establishing an informal task force of major national associations. It ought to open other channels for information and collaborative efforts. We have had several meetings with top executives of major educational associations. Two are with us today: Lowell Burkett of the American Vocational Association and Owen Kiernan of the National Association of School Principals. We hope through them and others to get their counterpart organizations at the state and local levels to join with us in this effort to bring a very worthwhile and challenging concept into our schools.. Dr. Hoyt, who has gone with the U. S. Office of Education as the chief staff man on career education, has participated in these meetings and has developed a draft on what career education is and what type of support we hope to get going. Dr. Marland mentioned yesterday the Gallup poll on education last August, and the surprisingly high proportion of unanimity and support among educators of this concept is almost like motherhood--everybody is for it. How we get it off the ground is the big question. It is vitally important for state and local school officials (including superintendents at the state and local levels, school principals, guidance counselors, curriculum developers, and teachers) to spread the word about what it is and what it can do. Furthermore, they should seek the active support and participation of the local and state Chambers and major individual employers in order to start the collaborative effort to get career education off the ground.

Perhaps a practical follow-up step and one that has already gotten underway in a number of states is to select at least a handful of communities or school districts in each state and get a career education project actually in practice there. Our Chamber invitation committee in late January visited Mesa, Arizona, which is one of the six pilot school districts funded by Office of Education money. In 1971 we were tremendously impressed with what was being accomplished there. As is the case in Louisiana, Arizona has made a statewide commitment to bringing career education into the state school system. I think this is encouraging. I think it indicates it's more than a concept or theory. Something that is action-oriented is being funded mainly by the state of Arizona, with some help from federal programs that are available.

Let me make it clear that the foregoing procedures are only in the preliminary stages as far as the Chamber is concerned at this time. We are hopeful, however, that official agreements with other national organizations will be made, and the effort will move ahead largely as outlined or as appears practical in other ways. We also hope to have the active support of the Council of Chief State School Officers. We had hoped to meet with some of your executives in Washington. They are busy men and they travel a great deal, but we hope to catch up with Dr. Hansford and Dr. Jesser in the near future.

In conclusion, I would like to call your attention to two views of education--one in ancient times and one more recently. Among other things that Confucious is alleged to have said is: "The expectations of life depend upon diligence, and the mechanic that will perfect his work must first sharpen his tools." Another man in the 19th century made a tremendous success of his own life and changed the state of the world. That was Thomas Edison. You know, I understand he was a drop-out. He never went to college, but he had this to say about education: "Education isn't play; it can't be made to look like play. It's hard work, but it can be made interesting work." Again, I think the career education concept gives us the opportunity to make it interesting work--work that is relevant and work that gives our students a chance to make something of themselves and make our country a better place for everybody.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is the message as we see it from one segment of the business community. We ask to join with you in this effort. We are ready to move ahead with you, but I believe that the professional educational fraternity has got to provide the main leadership. This is your ballgame, not ours. As Dr. Marland mentioned in opening this meeting yesterday, we are ready to go with everything we have in the way of support. You have got to pin down the ballgame. That doesn't mean there have to be the same rules in every state. One of the genius aspects of America is that you can be different and yet be the same. You can have a national program which doesn't have to

be identical in every state. We at the National Chamber look forward to working with you and other leaders in education in helping to improve the educational accomplishments of our young people and their practical success in later life. To the extent that there have been shortcomings, business and industry must share the responsibility, and this recognition will evoke greater cooperation than was generally forthcoming in the past. But prerequisite to any significant accomplishments by this very natural partnership is imaginative initiative and leadership by educators, both professionals and laymen. We urge the Chief State School Officers and other educational spokesmen to help us in publicizing the need for career education and in assuring employers and Chambers of Commerce that their contributions are needed and welcomed.

ALTERNATIVES FOR ACTION

Willard Wirtz
Former U. S. Secretary of Labor
and
President, The Manpower Institute

ALTERNATIVES FOR ACTION

Willard Wirtz

Our subject this afternoon is implementation, which I count significant in itself. We in this room recognize that most of us are similar in character and in circumstances as far as our occupations are concerned, which means that any taste for the subject of implementation has to be an acquired taste--about like castor oil. Recognizing Pennsylvania and Louisiana as the proving exceptions, almost all of us here chose our professions originally because we preferred the competition of ideas over any other competition that occurred to us at the time. We were credentialed for entry into our profession and were advanced through the early stages of it on the basis of what we could put on a piece of paper. Our minds have never been willing to give our tongues the free license which hucksters and hustlers in general, commercial and political, seem to enjoy.

Our largest professional pleasures are still enjoyed in solitude, and our inclination as individuals is still pretty much to be satisfied when we have persuaded ourselves and just a few others whose judgment we respect that we are right. Yet, either through the operation of Murphy's Law--which you know is "if anything can go wrong it will," or as a result of the operation of the Peter Principle, or, hopefully, as the product of something inside us, we have, despite this background in original choice, put ourselves in a position that involves as demanding, difficult, inevitably frustrating, and almost impossible a selling or activating job as can be imagined. We find ourselves in the most rapidly expanding enterprise in the society and the economy, except perhaps leisure. Yet we have found we have to finance this growth from funds which are conceived of, erroneously I think, as coming necessarily from the exploitation of natural resources which are now running out. So we are asked, and expected, to perform a miracle of loaves and fishes.

We are upbraided constantly for there being too few educational and job opportunities, and we would be severely reprimanded if we suggested in public that the alternative and perhaps better answer is that there are too many people. We work on a project which has to be paid for now and enjoyed later, denying us, therefore, the advantage of other salesmen's classical blandishment. It was suggested yesterday that education is a delayed action function, and our function when you think about it is such that the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of our adding to the value of the product which passes through our classrooms won't show up until years later, can't ever be measured, and will be thought of as only a nostalgic recalling of a Mr. Chip or a Ms. Block--never in terms of a principal or a superintendent or a chief state school officer. Basically we are facing today two sets of warring demands: that education be, first, democtized and individualized and, secondly, that education be more efficient

and cheaper. Yet there is a demand that there be the simultaneous improvement of both its quality and its equality.

It has been a great wasting of opportunity, it seems to me, that apparently both women and blacks have waged and are about to win their long overdue revolution without ever finding anything better to be equal to than white males. It's the additional and last part of our difficulty that we are now being asked to stage or wage a major social innovation. Innovation is always harder than running things fairly well as they are. We are asked to make a major social change, if you will, under five handicaps. First, there is no clearly identifiable, imperative crisis, which is the only proven catalyst for major social change in this country. Second, there is no clear constituency upon which we can fall, rely, or support. Third, there is no clearly identifiable locus of leadership as far as this change is concerned. Fourth, the proposed change appears, falsely, I think, to mean higher per capita taxes. Fifth, and finally, the change doesn't promise a single fast buck for anybody. That's a pretty tall order.

Well, is this, then, to be a counsel of despair as far as implementing these initiatives is concerned? Is it to be just a filing of grievances? Is it to be a falling back on what Governor Scott or Mr. Johnson of Mississippi suggested as a self-benediction and get out of it that way? No, except in one respect. I suppose that if I, personally, with my own future conveniently and pleasantly behind me, were to suggest a single initiative, it would be that this group of chief state school officers might issue a new Declaration of Independence proclaiming some truths that are by no means self-evident, but well ought to be. The gist of the declaration to parents and to individual students would be that if there is to be some improvement in this education/work experience and the relationship between these processes, they had better shape up and do something about it. Such a declaration might well constitute the single most effective product of a conference such as this, and yet I yield to what I assume is the truer circumstance and content myself with suggesting some more restrained alternatives.

As I turn to the matter of "alternatives for action," I would like to do it at a level which may be more restrained than a Declaration of Independence but which tries to synthesize what I heard here yesterday and today. I would like to add a few of my own thoughts to the subject and to raise it a little above the level of repair, a little above the matters of whether grants are to be categorical or consolidated, whether the structure of the Office of Education is to include a regional arrangement or something different, whether it is to be Title I, Title III, or Title V that ought to be expanded, or what the vocabulary ought to be, although those are important. I must say, as I have heard us talking about the differences between the several phrases, all multisyllabic and hard to understand, I can't help being reminded of the characteristics of my earlier profession--the law--including the fact that whenever the law comes to a difficult point, it finds some Latin

phrase to apply. It talks about habeas corpus and nobody really knows what habeas corpus is. When the lawyers in this country get into real trouble, they talk about nolo contendere. Nobody knows what that is either. So it is not peculiar to this situation that we have a little trouble with terminology when the chips are really down.

To suggest the approach that I would like to take, I rely on a story which is terribly old and in no way funny, quite poignant in fact, but suggests the level of consideration of our alternatives for action. I think of the three stone masons building at the base of the cathedral at Chartres, and being asked by a passerby what they were doing. The first one answered, "I am making a living." In response to the same question, the second stone mason said, "I am cutting blocks," and the third said, "I am building a cathedral." Well, ladies and gentlemen, I think we are working here on a cathedral. I think that the cathedral is named life, and what we are looking for are the principles of basic change. I grew up, incidentally, thinking that the form for change was government and that the function of education was more in the nature of conserving things. A professional life divided now about equally between education and government has led me to exactly the opposite conclusion. I do not think change is going to come from government or through government. Basically, I think it is going to come from and through education. It is to me a sobering, humbling, and a proud thought that if there is to be a major change in this country, the group of people assembled around this table will probably be in a position to do more about it than any other group in the country. I do not mean to embroider the point; I just think it's true. So I would like to suggest what I think are the basic elements of engineering involved in making this particular change--three elements, if you will, of a strategy for change.

As far as terminology is concerned, it is easiest for me to talk about the development of an education experience policy, noting particularly that part of that policy is an education/work policy. I move quite unflashingly to the consideration that it is all to the good to talk about the relationship between education and work, recognizing that work is only a part of subsequent life experience. If we could work out a better relationship between education and work, then we could go on to some of the harder problems of the relationship of education to leisure, if you will, and to the other things. I suggest three basic elements to describe the view of change. The first is that this initiative is now at the stage at which consolidation of forces and experience is both warranted and important. I recognize completely, as was reflected in the conversation yesterday afternoon, the value and competition of ideas in an R&D experimental change. Al Quie suggested that it takes about five years of conflicting notions before you find out which one is combative on the battlefield. As a matter of fact, that goes on indefinitely, but you do reach a point at which there has been enough competition of ideas, enough different kinds of experimentation--and the time to consolidate that experience has come. I think we are about there, and I suggest--I hope not impolitely--that there is

probably a cut-off point as far as litigating copyright claims which differ only in detail and terminology is concerned, and we might very well get on to defining what is common in our experience instead of what is different in our vocabulary.

It is part of the working dynamics of social change that the force of innovation tends to operate centrifugally--throwing off and dispersing at various points those who ought to be allies in the change--whereas the forces of inertia of the status quo, work centripetally--drawing down into a single and powerful vortex those who like the status quo for entirely different reasons but are attracted to the single fact of the status quo.

I point out the difference between consolidation and centralization. This point of consolidation comes up today in the context of particular concern about decentralization of some of the federal authority and money. I have mixed views about that, at least until I find out whether the trade-off is going to be decentralizing more authority with less money. I'm not sure about that yet, but I am talking about a different kind of thing particularly if these experiments are to be worked out at the local level, as I think they should be. It is very important to develop some further structure of organization for the consolidation of experience.

Let me suggest what I mean by the question of the consolidation of experiences. Three things have to be done. The first is a much more effective clearinghouse function for all of this development and experimentation than has been going on around the country so far. The great success stories around the country are hardly known beyond the boundaries of the state; more than that, the worst failure stories are equally limited in their larger value to the rest of us (so that we don't try what somebody else has already proved wrong). Then there is the matter of evaluation which has been referred to in passing. We have got to face up to that. Again Al Quie pointed out that the counterpoint of evaluation is likely to be control. We had better take our risks on that. I agree totally with Gene Sydnor's statement that "we have got to devise measurements of output in human terms instead of inputs in essentially cost or expense terms." We have got to get down to this matter of evaluation, and I think that is absolutely dependent upon spending the amount of money involved in making longitudinal studies of what we are doing. It seems to me the worst economy that we are measuring what we are doing by taking snapshots now, and then a year later taking another snapshot, and then another, seasonally adjusted to decimal-point precision with other snapshots of changes. It seems to me that we have got to take the expense of establishing a system of longitudinal studies which takes people on through the process and then looks back to see what happened. As a final, mechanical suggestion, if we could set up a comparative study of what is going on in about 15-20 different communities with different mixes of organizational structure, we would know a lot more than we do now about what we are doing. My first point is that consolidation of the experience now is an important element in the strategy of change.

Second, it's an illusion that alternatives for action are conceived of most pragmatically in terms of specific proposals for administrative and legislative action except as attention is also given the essential development of a public purpose which will support such action. The tough-minded reformer, the tough-minded idealist will think in terms of the hard job of persuading the democracy's membership as well as the easier task of advising its leadership. It is no more than a convenient half-truth that this persuasion is the leadership's function. I responded affirmatively, as I am sure you all did, to the suggestion yesterday of a meeting of chief state school officers with Al Quie, Carl Perkins, and John Brademas. I hope it happens, but we all know what the subject of that conversation would be. It would be 10 percent about what is right and 90 percent about what will pass. To talk about it in terms that separate out those two things is misleading. There has already been a suggestion that I will heartily endorse that would come back to Governor Scott's quiet little question, "About whose expectations are we talking? The leaders, the parents, or conceivably even the students themselves?" Until we talk more about that and address our proposal to that group, we are kidding ourselves.

It seems to me that the development of a requisite new public purpose depends here on doing, just to start, four things. The first, which I think has not been mentioned, is the development of a set of social indicators to complement our economic indicators. I have said before, and I apologize for the repetition, that we do in this country whatever we measure, and believe me, what we measure now makes a mockery of our underlying ideas as a country or even as a civilization. It also inhibits social change to rely entirely on economic indicators. To be specific, it seems to me that we have got to change the present unemployment/employment index, and we have to change the gross national product index. Until we do that, there won't be any basically significant change as far as the establishment of new purpose is concerned. There has got to be still another change; if the development of this new policy, education/experience or education/work, is to be an essentially local function, we have got to get over the convenience of relying on national aggregates and statistics and get those statistics down to the point where they can do something in administrative terms instead of as economic indicators. Just about a year ago this time, Japan established in place of its gross national product measurement, which resembled ours very closely, what they call a net national welfare index. It's in decimal point yen. It has been worked back so that they have the 1965, 1960, and 1955 comparisons. What it does is take what we call a gross national product and factor in as debits the cost of pollution, wastes of one kind or another, and reduced leisure time coming from increased commuting, and then factor in as assets such things as increased leisure time and work performed outside the marketplace. The worst travesty to which Libby Koontz referred in passing this morning, is that we measure both employment and unemployment in this country in our gross national product, leaving out most of what a great many women in this country do, and there is simply no good reason for it.

I don't understand why women are wasting their time on a constitutional amendment when so much more effectiveness would come from a change in the gross national product and its measurement. What it involves really is, if I go the a shop and make or sell a dress, the gross national product increases that much. If my wife stays home and makes a dress or raises a child, nobody is interestid in that and it doesn't count. Those things simply have got to be changed.

In that connection I call your attention to the volume of social indicators coming out of the Office of Management and Budget, which I think is probably the single most important document that has come off the press in quite a long time. I picked it up in some fear and trepidation and, especially when I saw how slick a publication it is, was doubly concerned because I was afraid they were going to come out with just enough social indicators to satisfy the demand for a great deal more. I don't believe you will get that impression when you read it though, especially with the accompanying introduction which says, "This is all we have so far and it's terribly incomplete, but it's a start." So you have now for the first time a whole group of indices covering employment, education, public safety, health, population, leisure and recreation, housing, and income. It is a marvelous document because it says what it doesn't measure, which includes attitude and a lot of other things. It seems to me that we have some reason to believe we are getting on toward accomplishing the first of these elements, having people do their thinking in social as well as economic terms.

The second point as far as the development of a constituency is concerned is to recognize that there is a potential coalition constituency here which has to be brought together. What is presently conceived of primarily as the program of improved education and entry employment of youth has to be made comprehensive so as to cover the self-interests of a lot of people, particularly those stranded in mid-career or women who have completed one piece of education or one piece of a career and want to move on to another. When we stop talking about building bridges for upper teenagers between the worlds of education and work and start talking about breaking up the time tracks in which we erroneously--during the industrial revolution--divided up the one world of life, we will be on our way. We will then at least have the elements to answer the question of whether career education is simply a substitute, as far as blacks are concerned, for a welfare program. We will also be on our way toward the development of a working coalition, a political coalition, which will have the majority vote, especially if we add other groups which we haven't referred to at all. I would take several groups like those kids presently at the education/work gap, mid-career groups, those who are displaced by machines and are now being placed in sinecures of one kind or another, and women who want to move from one career to another career, and I would add in the retirees who are today the victims of the illusion that leisure is an unskilled occupation. I would give all of them an opportunity to move back and forth between education and work. That coalition is here for the asking and the organizing.

I am not sure that there is going to be sufficient political support for any narrower part of that grouping.

The third point as far as the development of new public purpose is concerned has to be the development of a modus operandi. I noted with great interest in John Ottina's reference yesterday the suggestion that the approach was to analyze the needs of children and then to move on from there. I approve completely, but I am sure that you will welcome the suggestion which I find best put in a recent speech of Allen Pheifer, a man terribly important to any movement of this kind by virtue of both his position and his wisdom. He makes this suggestion:

> The most productive way that I have found to think about the future of our society is not to worry in the first instance about the requirements of institutions or about institutional preservation, important as this is, but to consider the needs of discrete groups of the population.

I am only suggesting that we identify a number of needs of a number of discrete groups, and we'll at least have a start on the whole thing.

The fourth and last of the elements of developing a new public purpose has been much emphasized here. We have got to work out the economics of whatever we are talking about, it has got to come out with a black "bottom line," as they say, and then it has got to be explained. Eugene Sydnor referred to the failing bond issues, Al Quie talked about a point going on to it, Gordon Swanson talked about the tax levies, etc. I would like to add to what's been suggested only three or four elements that are in any way beyond the commonplace. One of them is Eugene Sydnor's reference to the cost of our failures. We tried once to figure out the cost to the community of a lifetime of a single failure boy or girl, who goes out of school without the ability to support himself or herself. It's an almost impossible piece of mathematics, but conservatively it came to something between $150,000 and $200,000 a year everytime a child goes out without developing self-support. Just figure a $200,000 cost to that community over that individual's life. Now if we could get people to thinking in those terms, we would be on our way.

The second is that we have got to factor into these economics a full recognition of the potential value and worth of new forms of citizen participation. You are professional people, and your staffs are professional people, and it's going to be like pulling eye teeth to sell any of them on the value of volunteer service of one kind or another, but this country is full of people who want to serve and who could add greatly to the meeting of the economic demands of this situation.

Third, I would wish that we could do our mathematics without the constraints of the assumption that the potential development and use of human resources is necessarily limited by the supply and exploitability of natural resources. We have just got to get over that thinking. We

have got to start thinking in terms of human resources and natural resources as alternative raw materials of growth. It seems to me that current thinking about the economics of this subject is about at the point of an earlier debate about whether the world was flat or round. That is the difference between thinking in terms of growth just in terms of natural resources and expanding the thinking to include growth from human resources. As far as I am concerned, the future, like the world, has only horizons, and every single boundary is the result of human misconception.

Lastly, it does seem to me that a more effective interrelating of education and the rest of the life experience, including particularly but not exclusively work, very probably depends on the development of new structure, institutional structure, as on the devising of new programs.

Today we have learned three phrases. The first was consolidation, the second was new public purpose, and the third was structure. The pervasive but dubious assumption is that there can be a sufficiently increased interrelating of these life elements within the present institutional structure, relying largely on educators' new awareness of experience's imperatives and on an emergent "corporate social consciousness" to overcome the forces of both other institutional purpose and inertia within the institutional bureaucracy.

I have taken a little "trip" recently into the literature of the strategy of change. It is a strange and wonderful world, and it bothers me. I find there a quite unnerving suggestion that change of the kind we are talking about simply can't come within the present institutional structure. I feel that I am on pot or something of that kind and sort of enjoying it until I find other experts moving on to the hard drugs of "consciousness 3," John Birch societies, communist cells, and "therapeutic communities" of one kind or another. I can go only half way with it. It does seem to me that there are institutional structural changes which can be made without the trauma which comes from institutional revolution, but rather as institutional evolution.

Three suggestions come to mind about the kinds of structural problems and considerations which are involved here. There is, first, a very real question in my own mind about the validity of the assumptions which some educators seem to be making today about the structure of work, especially about what work will be in the future. Aaron Warner raised the question this morning of whether there are reliable projection techniques for finding out what work there will be in the future, and he said there are not. Let me give just one illustration of this. It bothers me that the country is being flooded with statements that there will be 4 million teachers educated in the decade of the '70's for only 2 million jobs. That is true if you assume the present student/teacher ratio; all false if you change the ratio by even two students per teacher. To talk about projecting in terms of the present structure of work or the demands for work is just as wrong as it can be. Charlie Radcliffe asked about the youth

employment figures. There isn't time now to answer him, except to say that those figures are totally unreliable and totally incorrect as a basis for any guidance at all. I used to be in charge of putting out that seasonally adjusted decimal point unemployment index. I used to think every month of Cervantes' little epigram, "Facts are enemies of the truth." The facts are just exactly as stated. The truth is totally different. You are talking about 14-15 percent. The country doesn't know that over half of those kids, 16-19 years old, are in school. They are looking for part-time work--evenings, weekends, holidays. So the figure overstates badly. It understates worse. It doesn't show that there is an average of success and failure. It doesn't point out that all an average does is prove to you that if you have got one foot in your refrigerator and one foot on your stove, you are, on the average, comfortable. It is grouping white boys and girls with black boys and girls so as to conceal the fact that as far as black girls between the ages of 16 and 19 years old are concerned, it is not 15 percent but about 35 percent. I predict that youth unemployment rates in their present form simply cannot be relied on, and those are the basic employment figures that you are working with when you talk about some of the things that you have in mind here. Another structure of difficulty Gene Sydnor pointed out in his reference to reading and wood-chopping is what work is and what work isn't. I was 57 before I found out that it is much more fun to do something with my hands than with my head. I have been using my head all my life and my hands not at all. Let me point out another illustration. Here we are going blindly ahead, getting more kids into college without realizing that the percentage of college graduates is going up just as the percentage of jobs requiring a college education is going down. We are beginning to look at the work being done by 16-19-year-olds only to find out that it probably will be growing more different every day from regular work as we conceive of it. Fewer kids are moving from entry-level jobs to the second- and third-level jobs, and the implications of that are simply unlimited. There is a real question about our understanding of the present structure of work.

My second point is about the structure of the federal government. It is quixotic to talk about a federal education/work policy as long as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is in charge of the educational process and the Department of Labor has the work responsibility. They are about 14 blocks apart, and the only way to get from one building to the other is to go all around the world. As long as we have got that kind of structural organization in the federal government, we are kidding ourselves about policies being worked out best. Reference has been made to the President's obviously sound proposal for the Department of Human Resources, including an Education and Manpower Division. The situation is not totally different as far as the state capitals are concerned, but I won't go into that here. I do point out that wherever you have a disjointed, sprawling government structure, you have a force which works on behalf of the status quo and which inhibits change because it is hard to get change through that kind of structure. Finally, I simply point out that at least some of the functions that the educational/employment institutions

assume responsibility for--guidance and counseling, for example--were once exercised by another institution, the family. We can't talk about strategy of change or about structure here without recognizing that part of the problem is that we now have two drop-out institutions on our hands--the church and the family--and we are becoming surrogate institutions for those other two.

I find another emergent theme in what has been said in this conference, and it's very hard to identify. That theme is community. Occupational education was first training for public employment; then it was broadened to training for service, and then broadened further to preparing youngsters not just to make a few bucks but to invest themselves in creating a new society. I propose that we identify the principle and purpose of everything we are talking about here by whatever title fits. Occupational education is only a part of it. There is a dilemma as far as developing new structures is concerned and new dilemmas as far as education is concerned. As far as my own view goes, the new structures which have to evolve must include some participation by the public in a much more direct form than it now participates in in either the educational or the employment institutions. I don't know whether you want more public participation or not. I am not sure that you do, but I think it is going to be absolutely essential. I think there ought to be in every local community in this country a community council which would be tri-partite in structure and include representatives of the schools, the employment community, and the public. I've represented the public for the last 30 years, and nobody can tell me anything about the difficulties of handling that client. It is never there when you need it. It doesn't know what it wants except that it doesn't want to pay much of anything for any services rendered in its behalf. It is an amorphous, giant, sprawling thing. It is terribly hard to organize. I don't think it is going to be properly represented through the present institutions. I think we have a better chance today of solving that problem than ever before because people now want to participate in their government more than they did before. I call your attention to two interesting initiatives. First, the Kettering Foundation is trying to develop, as some of you know, a citizens' involvement network. Second, there will shortly be an announcement of the John D. Rockefeller III bicentennial era program. It took 13 years to move from the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution. The most important thing that happened in those 13 years was the development of a new decision-making process which included the people in instead of including them out. Let's do the same thing during the bicentennial era program, which I suggest can be a very important rallying point as far as the interest we are talking about here is concerned.

I think it makes all kinds of sense to talk about building a cathedral of life. If this seems like too big an order, just for starters, think of Antigone saying to Ismene, "Until we have tried and failed, we have not failed." Through everything I've read and heard here, there is a total and complete conviction that the future is a good idea.

LEADERSHIP FOR EDUCATION

The Honorable Terry Sanford
Former Governor of North Carolina
and
President, Duke University

LEADERSHIP FOR EDUCATION

Terry Sanford

The concept that we are here to talk about offers many opportunities, not just in the narrow sense of looking to a new kind of program, a new concept, or a new approach, as important as that may be. I interpret the concept of career education to be the kind of education that comprehends what we should have comprehended all along, that we are preparing people for a kind of understanding and for building the groundwork so that whatever they do, they do it with a standard of excellence, a standard of pride, and a beginning understanding of the real meaning of their own lives. We're going to do many things differently, and we're certainly going to move into the future with much, much change. I recall a line from an article that Leslie Chain wrote, which said, "In a very real way, children live in the future." Children are going to be living in a future that we do not fully understand, and so I applaud all efforts to relate education to the understanding that children are going to need as they move on into the problems of life.

I was struck by a note on the back of the Education Digest that the U. S. Office of Education had reported that each year 2-1/2 million young people leave school without adequate preparation for careers. Now, I don't know exactly where they got that figure or at what point some of those students may have dropped out before graduation, but that compares with a total of about 2-3/4 million who do graduate, which begins to show the need for new concepts, innovations, and changes in curricula and in methods of putting schools together. It certainly demonstrates that we have failed in many ways. Now, that's nothing new, because we've known all along that the schools as we have organized them and as we have trained people to teach in them have not always reached all of the children. We've tried various ways to improve, and we will continue to do so.

I read an article in Educational Leadership by William C. Miller who had some questions to raise about the usefulness of career education, but I think that was simply a discussion to lay the proper understanding of the people reading that article. I was struck by one sentence because it got to a common theme that I've talked about and felt was important for a long time. He said, "Its greatest assets are the fresh hope it can bring for curriculum improvement and the new approaches it can provide for revitalization of instructional programs." I agree. I think it provides new hope, new opportunities, and new ways that we can find to associate with the new understanding and interest on the part of many people outside the education profession. It gives us many opportunities to find a new educational sunrise, and we can make

this approach to education a means as well as an end, a means of building a broader understanding and, therefore, gaining broader support for education.

The public image of education is not as good as it has been in some years past. In fact, in many ways it's been in a downward spiral. Too often people have felt that their children were not getting what they should get from their school experience. Taxpayers have been revolting in one form or another. Craig and I helped put some taxes on people here. You know, they're still fussing about it, but they're still supporting the schools. Craig's getting a big hunk of money from the legislature tomorrow that wouldn't be there if we hadn't had the courage to ask people to accept higher taxes for the sake of our children. I point this out simply to say that when you're toting that bale, you've got to understand that sometimes they're going to put the whip to your back, regardless of whether you are promoting new programs or new taxes. When I was campaigning for governor, I moved around the state telling people how much we needed to do about education--that we needed to pay the teachers more, that we needed to buy more books for the libraries, that we needed to have more teachers so we could have fewer students in each classroom, that there were all kinds of things that we needed to do. I was down in a little eastern North Carolina town telling all of this when some lady stood up in the back and asked, "Where are you going to get the money to do all of that stuff?" That sort of sounded like she was a heckler. I looked around, but I didn't see anybody from a newspaper. I said, "Where do you think we're going to get it? We're going to get it from taxes." Well, everybody broke out in applause. As I was leaving, I said to my campaign manager, "That was absolutely remarkable. I have never seen anything like it. I said we were going to get the money from taxes, and everybody applauded. I think I'm going to make that part of my campaign." He said, "I wouldn't be too quick about that. I think they thought you said you were going to get it from Texas." We did get it, though, and it is here.

We're going to need to continue now to develop the kind of support that we developed in the early 1960's when people willingly supported new taxes because those taxes supported education, and those educational opportunities, in turn, opened up opportunities for their children, their neighbors' children, and all of the people of North Carolina. That was a time in the life of this state when people understood that putting money in education was the best possible investment they could make, and they were ready to pay and move to improve the schools. We need to get back to that understanding, and career education offers a means of getting back. I think people understand that this approach is a genuine effort to relate education to the needs of young people and society, and that something constructive is being done. It's not the same old thing of educating people almost out of past experience instead of future hopes. I think you can use exciting programs such as this one to generate the kind of support that will make it possible for you to do even more to

improve education, to gain support, and to gain the public confidence we need. We need to make the people of the country believe we can do the job of using education to provide opportunities for all people. We need to make them understand that we can design the kind of a school system and broad educational programs that will reach out for all people with all talents.

We need to let the people know that education can serve society in unorthodox as well as orthodox ways. For example, we had a well-intentioned program underway to end poverty. I never did think it was quite the concept we should have had because I always saw the assault on poverty as an educational program--unorthodox, yes, but nevertheless educational--that would attack the causes of poverty, which is quite a different thing. I think we should now pick that up again and not say, "That was a failure so we're not going to try it again." "The poor will always be with us," some people are pleased to say. Education can mean something to people's lives individually and to the lives of their children, not just the passing of grades in a school, but getting something out of it. We can make education as exciting as it has been at some times in the past, in some places; and as we move to make education exciting and bring to it a new approach, a sense of freshness, we will gain the kind of support education is entitled to have and must have. Duke University has attempted to do its part.

A couple of weeks ago I spent a day in an elementary school where Duke had provided some additional resources. The significant thing to me was that that school was a really exciting place. Every little kid in that school was excited about going. They didn't want to go home. They were anxious to get there in the mornings to find out what was going to happen each day. It wasn't that Duke put a little money into it; it was that the superintendent of the system cut loose the principal to do what he wanted to do. The principal, in turn, cut loose his teachers to innovate change and literally let down walls, and the teachers called on the children to be a part of the new, creative approach in their little school.

I think too often we attempt to plan from above and require conformity; things have to be done a certain way. It's so much easier for a city superintendent to require uniformity and conformity of his principals than to take a chance on cutting them loose. One reason it's easier is that he doesn't have to take the flack for mistakes because the deadly mistakes that come from conformity aren't noticed by the public, and the other way, some principal might do something that was wild enough to get an unfavorable press comment and upset the superintendent. I think that's where your leadership comes in because you can encourage people charged with the administration of school systems to cut loose their principals, teachers, and students to innovate, change, and make education exciting. A lot of good ideas will come out of that kind of approach. Where your leadership comes in is in seeing to it that personnel

get the encouragement and protection to open up the system in this respect. I think creativity is being killed off every day in almost every school across the country; and if we are going to build back the public confidence, we've got to get away from killing off creativity. We've got to get away from being slaves to conformity, and we need to provide the kind of fresh leadership that lets the public know that we are doing something about their children and their problems and opening up opportunities in their society.

I'd like to feel that somehow we could break into that new hopeful period of excitement in the way we teach teachers. I haven't been satisfied at all, and while I haven't intended to be insulting, I have pointed out that most schools and colleges of education are extremely dull. (I said that to the Duke department, but I said it with enough of a smile that they were sure that I meant it constructively.) We haven't done enough to train at the college level the administrators and teachers who are becoming, by that training, professionals. We haven't done enough to give them the sense of experimentation and excitement that they should carry forward into their professional lives. I think that is where we have failed. Some few places are beginning to change and turn around, and some are beginning to take a new look at the way teachers are trained. We have determined at Duke that we are going to do something different. For the moment we are calling it an Institute of Education. We might call it something else, but the idea is that teachers cannot go through the same old procedure of reading the same old textbooks and following the same old courses and still come out prepared to take part in the kind of school system that you are talking about designing, the kind of system that we are going to need to gain the public support we need. We might call it an Institute of Learning and Teaching. It seems to me that the understanding of education--knowing something about teaching and learning, knowing something about the profession--should not be limited to people who are going to pursue that profession as a lifetime career. Because education spills over more and more and will continue to spill over into the lives of all of us, because education's becoming the main core of public decision-making, because of what we do in public understanding of education in and out of Congress and in state legislatures, and because citizens are working with schools at the community level, more and more citizens are caught up in the process of education. I would like the students who go through our university, no matter what they're going to be--engineers, journalists or historians--to know enough about the process of education to understand what society needs from education and what education can provide to society. We want to make a kind of Institute that spreads out across all the departments, worries about the teacher training, and worries about the profession, but additionally involves all people as all citizens must be involved in knowing more about the educational process.

This is where the Chiefs come in, it seems to me, because there is reason right now for cheer and encouragement. The time is here when we can gain public support if we will get across to the public the sense of excitement that we have. I don't know where leadership starts if it doesn't start with you. This is nothing new with me. I contended a long time ago that we needed to shape educational policy at the state level, that we needed to look to the states primarily to provide the kind of leadership that would improve the schools. Historically, the schools have belonged to the states; historically, also, the better schools have been strongly supported by state appropriations. If we are going to have a viable policy or policies flexible enough to suit all of our requirements and needs all over this diverse country, we need to leave this source of strength and leadership with the states. The compact for education--the Education Commission of the States--was founded on the belief and the conviction that leadership has to come from all of you working at the state level, mobilizing there the kind of support, the kind of understanding, that education must have. I didn't purposely neglect the local school boards in saying that, because this is the kind of leadership that encourages and supports the local school endeavor. Nor did I neglect the federal level, because there are many things the national government should be doing that it hasn't been doing. The national government has never truly faced up to its obligation to provide its share of support for education. I would not want to see, and I'm sure you would not want to see, the kind of support that carries with it direction.

Just to take an excellent example, career education is a good thing. It's a good concept. Therefore, somebody out there directs that all school systems will adopt it right now or have their funds cut off. That's not going to be our approach. In times past, that may have been the attitude in Washington on the part of some people, but not many. I think almost everybody now understands that that cannot work. One central source of direction is not going to build a school system that serves every child in the nation. The leadership still must come from you. That is not to say that leadership cannot involve, as it must involve, an insistence that the national government do its share in the financial support of education. For lots of reasons, Constitutional and otherwise, the national government has the greatest source of revenue available to the governments of this federal system; but, because those funds are available there, the obligation is there to apply those funds where the people are and where the need is. I think one of the big tasks over the next decade is going to be to convince the national government that general support for secondary and elementary education should approach 1/3 of the total cost. That's an arbitrary figure but a fairly realistic one. How is that going to be done? Are a few Congressmen going to get together and say that it should be done? Or will you provide the leadership that spreads out to people all over the country and says, "We're going to do our part in designing an exciting, far-reaching school program; we're going to do our part in getting state support; we're going to do our

part in the improvement of education; and we're going to insist that our national leaders do their part in providing the kind of financial support that can be provided only from that source"?

There is an army available to you that can be mobilized--friends, parents, people who understand what education can do for society, citizens everywhere--but we need a focal point, leadership. That leadership rests with those of you who head the efforts of education in the various states, because that is where the responsibility is; and because the responsibility is there, that responsibility, that opportunity, and that chance for fulfillment are yours.

IMPLEMENTATION STEPS . . . WHERE DO THE CHIEFS GO FROM HERE?

Dr. John R. Ottina
U. S. Commissioner of Education

IMPLEMENTATION STEPS . . . WHERE DO THE CHIEFS GO FROM HERE?

John R. Ottina

We have spent two days here together, two glorious, exciting, informative, and emotional days, and we owe a great deal to both our sponsors and their respective staffs for having us here and for stimulating this dialogue between us. I am sure that, unlike ships that pass in the night, each and every one of us will be affected by our meeting. We will be influenced by the events in which we have participated, and we will, I am sure, react in the manner described in George Quarles' pamphlet. Each of us will hear a different beat of the drum, and each of us will march to a different tune.

Pursuing this theme, let me take a few moments to run over the highlights of our mutual experiences in the past two days. I would like to put on the hat of a music critic for a moment, even though this is a role for which I am totally unqualified, and describe for you the beat of the drum that I heard in something I would like to call "A Symphony in Four Movements for a Comprehensive Educational Orchestra." Those of you who are knowledgeable music critics, please excuse my terminology.

I may be way off base (to mix a metaphor), but as I heard it, the first movement was a fugue in three parts. One part of the orchestra was playing career education, one part was playing occupational education, and one part was playing vocational education. Like most fugues I have heard, it created a kind of tension, a sense of uncertainty. It raised such issues as: What is it? What does it mean? Whose responsibility is it? Should we wait for research before we push ahead?

It created a conflict within me as I heard certain themes echo and re-echo from the section in this orchestra assigned to the vocational education part. I heard a theme that asked, "Whose money is it . . . whose money is it?" Yet, in spite of that confusion, in spite of that tension, there seemed to be a kind of force behind this movement, an overpowering force that said, "We must go on." Through the voices of some 93 percent of parents, we heard, "We must go on." As we looked at the efforts that have been made at local and state levels--the dedication and the diligence--the music cried, "Things have happened. They have already occurred." It was clear that in this movement the composer was building a momentum which should not and could not be stopped.

After a brief intermission, we went into the second movement of this symphony. I call it pianissimo. It has a theme with which I could begin to identify, to compare with other things I was familiar

with and which we had done. We talked about things like a need for qualified staff, a purpose that federal, state, and local agencies have joined together in trying to serve. We talked about the need for parental involvement--a role in which, again, a certain amount of leadership has been shown by both state and federal organizations. There is a need for community involvement--a role whose importance we began to understand more and more as the days went on.

We heard another theme--lifelong learning--and, as the orchestra expanded, we included sections that dealt with postsecondary education, college and university education. While this was going on, two stagehands were having some kind of discussion about where to put the chairs for the orchestra--whether they should be all in one place or whether we should have ten sets of chairs--in Boston, New York, Atlanta, and so on. I didn't quite understand how that got worked into the theme, but it seemed like an interesting discussion.

This second movement engendered in all of us a feeling of familiarity and tranquility, for we were talking about things we were accustomed to, talking about roles we understood.

We then moved into the third movement, and here the development of the theme was entrusted to a section in the educational orchestra on which we do not usually rely to develop a theme. I listened carefully, as I am sure many of you did, because I expected that the expected theme would not prevail but that, instead, the counterpoint--"education is for jobs . . . education is for jobs"--would prevail. We did not hear that, however. We heard from this section a full development of the theme of what we were talking about here. I heard, "Education is for all." I heard, "We have got to restructure what we are doing to take into account a very rapidly changing society--educationally, technologically, and in the labor market." I heard the plea for better ties with the community, better ties between education, labor, and industry.

Throughout, two voices seemed to dominate. One, again from this unusual section, sang out that this was a means of motivating young people and adults and that we, who are more accustomed to applying our orchestration to those pieces of this educational symphony that we are most familiar with, are overlooking an untapped reservoir and should find better ways to tap that reservoir. It seems to me that some heard a beat they were going to march to.

The chairman said, "We see a role for us, some 'next steps.'" We see that we can, through publicity, magazine articles, and the speaker's bureau, tap a resource to come into our localities and our schools and help us develop this theme. We see that this is one of

the beats we can march to and, further, we see that we can, in each community, form a task force, a coalition of support for this movement.

But is this scene misplayed? It seems that we have heard a very challenging note create discord in this melody. Since we were talking about national expectations, it was right that the challenge came, "What is the climate of national expectations? What is it that we must expect?" In a small voice the answer came back, "I thought that we must together, looking at this whole orchestra, develop and expand not only educational but labor opportunities."

Suddenly, in the back, the brass section stood up and sounded a clear and resounding tone which captured the interest and momentum that had been developed in the first movement and echoed again in the second. Gordon Swanson heard some beats and enunciated what he thought were some next steps and directions.

First of all, he said we should form a group of Chiefs, and as I heard that beat I asked, "What about the task force the Chiefs already have on this? How should we use that?" He talked about a coalition of postsecondary education, and I looked at our hosts here in North Carolina and thought of a similar institution at Ohio State and asked, "How should we use these resources in developing our next step?"

He talked about an interrelationship with the feds. In that he struck a beat with which I can well identify, and I said, "Yea, verily, indeed, that is what we are all about." That is what Bill Pierce, Ken Hoyt, the vocational education staff, and the occupational education staff that will soon come into play are all about. He said we should worry about tomorrow's needs in problem-solving, and I am sure that all ears picked up that note.

Then we turned to the fourth movement. I prefer to call it the fourth movement and not the finale because for the first time I began to understand in this group what I thought it was all about. It seemed to me that the first three movements were really a prologue to a much richer and deeper concept and idea. The fugue we heard was just one of many fugues that need to be played, in which all of the educational resources and noneducational resources need to be examined in terms of what they can contribute and what role they must play in the educational process.

The beat that I heard was from a man who said, "It's a beat for all America. It is a movement, a concept, that can be used to reform education and society. It is a means of meeting our challenge for tomorrow." To me the beat was made very clear. He said, "First we should consolidate our experiences and share them through clearinghouses,

through evaluations." If there ever was a note that I could respond to and be in tune with, that was one. The federal government is in an ideal position to help.

He talked about a new public purpose, and here he came with me to the very heart of what American society is all about--how inadequate our indices of measurement are, and how inconsistent we are in terms of our goals and our measurement of these goals. He laid down a challenge for all of us to think more about what it is that we are trying to achieve. He then went on to develop this public purpose by talking about the inclusion of women in mid-career preparation. I paused for a moment, thinking,

> Why do we need to be reminded of this when, from the very beginnings of our thoughts in this movement of reform and change, we had conceptualized it to include women, those in mid-career, retired persons, and others? How did we lose track of this? Where did we drop the ball in understanding where it is that we've been trying to go?

He talked a little bit about economics, and I remembered taking out a pad of paper and pencil and coming to the very same conclusions. Education is cost-beneficial. No doubt about this. It is a clear and easy case to make. It is cost-effective. It is very clearly a responsibility that we must undertake.

Then he talked about new institutional structures, and here again we were reminded that education has been asked to carry an ever-increasing load or responsibility. As he and other scholars have noted, the traditional institutions that have been relied upon in the development of the human being--his morality, his culture, his understanding, and his well-being--have changed. Many of them no longer exist for many of our citizens, and the burden has fallen on our shoulders.

THE HIDDEN AGENDA: A SUMMARY

John K. Coster

I accepted the invitation of my colleagues on the planning committee to summarize this conference before I became aware of John Ottina's extraordinary talents. Anything that might be said after Dr. Ottina's brilliant analysis is anticlimactic. I only wish that every educator in America could have heard it.

During the week, I have been asked if there is a hidden agenda at this conference, and I have denied it. Now, at the conclusion of the conference, I should like to change my plea. There is a hidden agenda, and it is called Charles and David Coster. Charles is 10 and in the fifth grade, and David is nine and in the fourth grade. This conference was held because of a concern for the quality and relevance of schooling that Charles and David Coster and all the Charleses and Davids throughout the nation are getting. Good as it is, American education is not as good as it ought to be, especially for those Charleses and Davids who will not get their vocational education in colleges and universities.

In light of this hidden agenda, I would like to summarize four points of concern which have emerged from our conference. The first is a re-examination of American educational philosophy. I had hoped that we might start here, or at least in the near future, the development of an indigenous American philosophy of education that is addressed to three points: reform--that is, changing the system from a system of exclusion to one of inclusion; comprehensiveness--that is, education that meets reasonable criteria in terms of clientele, purpose, content, style of learning, preservation of the culture, advancement of life, span of ages served, and, when speaking of vocational education, the range of the occupational structure; and responsiveness--which relates to students, parents, the community, and American ideals.

The second concern is for legislation. Many of the participants here are working in that area. What kind of legislation will be written that will result in education's being accountable to students, parents, and especially those who have not fared so well in sharing the benefits of this society, particularly women, minority groups, handicapped persons, and the aged? When will we get a Morrill Act for elementary, secondary, and vocational education that will change their structure in a manner similar to that which changed higher education a century ago?

The third concern is for bringing vocational education into the mainstream of the American educational system. The original vocational education act, the Smith-Hughes Act, clearly put vocational education under public supervision and control. Vocational education is a subsystem of the public educational system; yet, among those of us who are vocational educators, few believe that the system has truly accommodated

vocational education. I hope the cry for relevance is heard here by the managers of the several state systems throughout the nation.

The fourth concern is for establishing more fully the partnership between state and federal governments. Education in America has been thought of as a function of the states, but the impetus for vocational education has come largely through the acts of the Congress of the United States. Vocational educators have been prone to look to the federal government for leadership and guidance. Now, there is nothing wrong with providing leadership at the national level, but with the possibilities of revenue sharing and decentralization, increased responsibility at the state level is evident. The federal Vocational Education Personnel Development Program has been directed toward increasing the capacity of the state systems to respond to the need for leadership and new directions. The question is--Will the managers of the state systems, the Chiefs, take up the gauntlet?

The next step is your agenda. We have brought out the questions and issues, and we have delineated the hidden agenda. What will you do to make the American educational system the kind of system that Charles and David Coster and all the Charleses and Davids of America deserve?

It has been a pleasure to have all of you here. We hope you enjoyed it, and we hope you remember Pinehurst.

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT BY THE LATE NELSON JACK EDWARDS
FORMER VICE-PRESIDENT
UNITED AUTO WORKERS OF AMERICA

Introduction to the Remarks by Nelson Jack Edwards

Sitting with the Chiefs during each session were three or four catalysts who reacted along with the Chiefs to these presentations. In the opening session of the conference, one of the catalysts was the late Mr. Nelson Jack Edwards, Vice-President of the United Auto Workers of America. Mr. Edwards' general comments in response to Dr. Marland and others are quite pertinent, and they are included here as a tribute to him and as representation of the remarks made by the catalysts who contributed to the spirit and atmosphere of the conference.[1]

General Comments by Nelson Jack Edwards

I'm pleased to have been invited to act as a "catalyst" in your conference. I might say that the conference today deals with one of the most important--and most complicated--educational problems facing our society today. As you can well guess, it is a problem which greatly concerns the UAW and our nation's 1,300,000 members.

First of all, our UAW families want their sons and daughters to be educated in ways that will equip the youngsters for the realities of life. And one main reality of life is that a person needs satisfying, meaningful work to sustain himself and his family. We have to question, however, whether our educational system is doing an adequate job of preparing young people for working lives that will satisfy them both economically and intellectually. Do our schools give the basic training necessary for the kinds of occupations available today?

Let me answer that question by pointing to a glaring contradiction which exists today. We are, in many areas of our nation, in a state of economic recession--especially in Michigan and in other highly industrialized states. Unemployment is close to 11 percent in many areas and is well above 5 percent nationally. Yet all these people are not necessarily

---

[1]Approximately 15 leaders in America served as "catalysts" to the conference. Space limitations preclude the publication of all their comments. We have chosen to include the comments of Nelson Jack Edwards, whose untimely death is mourned by all who knew him, as a tribute to Mr. Edwards.

out of work because there are no jobs available. Let me illustrate this by showing you the "Help-Wanted" sections of two newspapers--The Los Angeles Times and The Detroit News. In the Los Angeles Times on March 11, there were ten pages of classified ads seeking workers. In the News, there were three pages. And what kinds of jobs were these? Scores of them were for skilled and semi-skilled workers and technicians--bridgeport machine operators, medical technologists, pipefitters, plastic mold builders, lathe hands, registered nurses, computer programmers and technicians. In fact, most of the employment opportunities were not for college graduates but for individuals who could have stepped into meaningful, decent-paying jobs if they had received the right kind of vocational education.

That, I submit, is our basic problem: educating our nation to fill the employment opportunities available today--and the employment opportunities that will become available tomorrow through our rapid expansion of new technology. The demand is there and the supply of potential workers is there, but we haven't yet crossed the educational gap that would bring the two together.

Now, perhaps I can phrase some specific questions about some very real problems to be solved: What can be done to guarantee adequate financial support of occupational and vocational education programs on the local and state levels? I am not happy to admit that Michigan ranks about fortieth among the fifty states in support of such education at the state level.

What ways and means do we have available to convince and "sell" our youth and their parents on the importance and advantage of securing skills through high school that will adapt our youngsters for entering the world of work? What ways do you see of both labor and industry playing a more meaningful role in organizing and conducting vocational education in our public schools?

How do we carry out the goals of a career education movement by seeing that all education--from kindergarten through the 12th grade--is career or vocation oriented?

What would you do about changing the teacher training institutions to make sure that courses and curricula are vocation or career oriented?

Should we be carrying out research into the needs of today and tomorrow in business and industry? Should we be conducting research into job trends? Should direct links be established between the schools and industry, business and labor, to develop cooperative work experience programs?

What kind of job are we doing--and what should we be doing--to remove employment and vocational barriers for blacks, females and other minorities? Do we do an adequate job of counseling youngsters for entering vocations

and choosing educational programs to prepare them for those jobs? Is there enough work being done by schools in cooperation with the federal, state and local equal employment opportunity compliance agencies to meet the needs of labor, business and industry in training blacks, females and other minorities?

One last question: Is our political system "tuned in" to the need for federal and state legislation in the areas of vocational training and career development? And, if not, what should we do to get our elected politicians on the ball?

Mr. Edwards' Comments in Response to Dr. Sidney Marland's Presentation

On the question of the relationship between progress in the area of occupational and vocational education and progress in civil rights, unless every man has the right to learn a job that will enable him to earn a decent living, he cannot be said to have established first-class citizenship in his community and nation. To have the right to a job without the qualifications for one can lead to bitter frustration and the destruction of initiative and faith in one's self.

With regard to educators who express some misgivings and, in some instances, alarm over the modest participation of industry and labor in the formulation of vocational programs, I feel that such misgivings and alarms are unjustified and clearly not in the best interests of those whom we seek to help. Surely no one knows better the needs and the fine nuances of the contemporary world of work than industry and labor, who are directly engaged in it on a day-to-day basis. How to teach and get the student to learn is still quite properly the province of the educators, but it surely serves no constructive purpose to prepare today's youngsters for yesterday's jobs.

On the question of state power or administration, I will surely concede that there are certain programs that can and should be administered by the state. However, I also firmly believe that if minimal standards are to be observed across the country, the federal government must have, at the very least, a monitoring authority and power to act to ensure that the states are carrying out the intent of Congress in their implementation of federal legislation on education.

As Dr. Marland observed, with the strong federal legislative support and intervention in the field of education in the 1960's, we thought we had really turned the corner and would be making revolutionary strides. Yet we find a decade later, as he points out, that we have reverted to the same old system of woefully inadequate support of education, particularly vocational education. The institutions of education in this country are in deep trouble, because while in a relative sense we may be spending more, the hard fact is that we are achieving much less.

With respect to the allocation of $100 to every student if an appropriation of $5 billion could be secured, I am in total opposition to this

kind of "equality." It would not meet the problem and would be grossly unfair to the school districts with a low tax base. The gross inequalities that already exist between districts where, for an example, parents are capable of assisting their child academically and others where they are not would surely not be removed or even dented by a $100 per student allocation. There is just no way to leave the problems confronting our educational institutions untended and expect that they will somehow just evaporate. We have to find solutions to these problems because they will surely multiply, and coming generations will have a far more difficult task finding solutions than we have today.

The teacher-counselor question is one that, in my judgment, could be corrected if the counselors and teachers spent more time in measuring the child's academic capability and relating it to the child's needs to enter the world of work with a meaningful and salable skill. The high school still trains for its historical function of college preparation. Approximately 20 percent of high school students go to college, yet major emphasis is placed in this area by academic tradition and power. In the American dream all children must go to college to amount to anything. The academic community which runs the schools and colleges, by and large, reflects this attitude. In my view, this attitude must change.

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Dr. A. Craig Phillips, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, North Carolina, Co-Chairman
Dr. John K. Coster, Director, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University, Co-Chairman
Ms. Mollie W. Shook, Co-Director of the Career Education Professional Personnel Development Project, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University, Conference Director
Mr. George Kahdy, Deputy Assistant State Superintendent for Program Services, North Carolina, Conference Co-Director
Dr. Sidney P. Marland, President of College Entrance Examination Board, New York, Conference Consultant
Mr. Lowell Burkett, Executive Director of the American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Floyd Christian, Chief State School Officer, Florida
Dr. Joe Clary, Executive Director of State Advisory Council, North Carolina
Dr. Jerome H. Melton, Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction, North Carolina
Dr. Jack Nix, Chief State School Officer, Georgia
Dr. William Pierce, U. S. Deputy Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

ALABAMA
Leroy Brown

ALASKA
Marshall L. Lind

ARIZONA
Weldon P. Shofstall

ARKANSAS
A. W. Ford

CALIFORNIA
Wilson Riles

COLORADO
Donald D. Woodington

CONNECTICUT
William J. Sanders

DELAWARE
Kenneth C. Madden

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Barbara Sizemore

FLORIDA
Floyd T. Christian

GEORGIA
Jack P. Nix

HAWAII
Shiro Amioka

IDAHO
D. F. Engleking

ILLINOIS
Michael J. Bakalis

INDIANA
Harold Negley

IOWA
Robert Benton

KANSAS
C. Taylor Whittier

KENTUCKY
Lyman V. Ginger

LOUISIANA
Louis J. Michot

MAINE
Carroll R. McGary

MARYLAND
James A. Sensenbaugh

MASSACHUSETTS
Gregory Anrig

MICHIGAN
John W. Porter

MINNESOTA
Howard B. Casmey

MISSISSIPPI
Garvin H. Johnston

MISSOURI
Arthur L. Mallory

MONTANA
Delores Colburg

NEBRASKA
Cecil E. Stanley

NEVADA
Kenneth H. Hansen

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Newell J. Paire

NEW JERSEY
Edward W. Kilpatrick

NEW MEXICO
Leonard J. Delayo

NEW YORK
Ewald B. Nyquist

NORTH CAROLINA
A. Craig Phillips

NORTH DAKOTA
M. F. Peterson

OHIO
Martin W. Essex

OKLAHOMA
Leslie R. Fisher

OREGON
Dale P. Parnell

PENNSYLVANIA
John C. Pittenger

RHODE ISLAND
Fred G. Burke

SOUTH CAROLINA
Cyril B. Busbee

SOUTH DAKOTA
Donald Barnhart

TENNESSEE
Benjamin Carmichael

TEXAS
J. W. Edgar

UTAH
Walter D. Talbot

VERMONT
Robert A. Withey

VIRGINIA
Woodrow W. Wilkerson

WASHINGTON
Frank Brouillet

WEST VIRGINIA
Daniel B. Taylor

WISCONSIN
Barbara Thompson

WYOMING
Robert G. Schrader

AMERICAN SAMOA
Mikolao I. Pula

CANAL ZONE
David A. Speir

GUAM
Katherine B. Aguon

PUERTO RICO
Celeste Benitex de Rexach

PACIFIC ISLANDS
John A. Richard

VIRGIN ISLANDS
Harold C. Haizlip

APPENDIX D

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Dr. A. Craig Phillips
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
North Carolina

Dr. Sidney P. Marland, President
College Entrance Examination Board
New York

Mrs. Martha Bachman
Member, National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education, Delaware

Mr. Nelson Jack Edwards
Vice-President, United Auto Workers
Michigan

Mr. George Quarles
Director of Career Education, New York
City Public Schools

Dr. Gordon I. Swanson
Professor, University of Minnesota

The Honorable Albert Quie
Member, U. S. House of Representatives,
Ranking Minority Member of the House Education
and Labor Committee, Minnesota

Mr. Jack Jennings
Majority Counsel, U. S. House Subcommittee
on General Education, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Eugene Sydnor
Vice-President, Southeastern Region of the
U. S. Chamber of Commerce
Virginia

Mr. Charles Radcliffe
Minority Counsel, U. S. House Education
and Labor Committee
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Robert W. Scott
Executive Vice-President, North Carolina
Agri-Business Council, Inc.

Dr. Aaron Warner
Dean, School of General Studies,
Columbia University, New York

The Honorable Willard Wirtz
President, The Manpower Institute
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Nolan Estes
Superintendent, Dallas Independent School District
Texas

Dr. Rupert Evans
Professor, University of Illinois

Dr. Owen Kiernan
Executive Secretary, National Association
of Secondary School Principals
Virginia

The Honorable Terry Sanford
President, Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. John Ottina
U. S. Commissioner of Education
Washington D. C.

Dr. Mel Barlow
Professor, University of California at
Los Angeles

Mr. Lowell Burkett
Executive Secretary, American Vocational
Association
Washington, D. C.

Dr. William Pierce
Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult
Education
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz
Assistant Secretary, North Carolina
Department of Human Resources

Dr. Byrl Shoemaker
Ohio State Director of Vocational Education

Dr. Francis Tuttle
Oklahoma State Director of Vocational
Education

Dr. John K. Coster
Director, Center for Occupational Education
North Carolina State University

APPENDIX E

LIST OF OBSERVERS

Mr. Dick Bobbitt
819 North Marsalis
Dallas, Texas 75203

Dr. Bob Childers, Executive Secretary
Commission on Occupational Education Institutions
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Mr. Tilton Davis, Chief
General Education Development Services
U. S. Army
Washington, D. C. 20202

Dr. Calvin Dellefield, Executive Director
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

Dr. Carl Dolce, Dean
School of Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Mr. Edmund Glaezer, Jr., President
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Washington, D. C. 20202

Dr. Thomas Glennan, Director
National Institute of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

Dr. David Hampson
Career Education Task Force
National Institute of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

The Honorable R. Barton Hayes
Member, North Carolina State Board of Education
Hudson, North Carolina

Dr. George Herbert, President
Research Triangle Institute
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709

Dr. Lance Hodes
Career Education Task Force
National Institute of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

Mr. David Jesser, Coordinator
Chief's Career Education Project
Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dr. Charles Law
North Carolina State Director of Occupational Education
Raleigh, North Carolina

Dr. Richard Ray
Vinture and Associates
Southern Pines, North Carolina

Mr. James Reid, President
State Directors Association
Division of Vocational-Technical Education
Baltimore, Maryland 21240

The Honorable John M. Reynolds
Member, North Carolina State Board of Education
Asheville, North Carolina 28804

Dr. Robert Stoltz, Vice-President
College Entrance Examination Board
Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Dr. Grant Venn
Calloway Professor of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

REPORTS IN THE
CAREER AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERIES

1. Coster, John K. **The Development of a Vocational-Technical Education Personnel Development Program in a State**

2. Coster, John K., and Nicholas L. Paul. **Seminar for Developing State Programs for Vocational Education Professional Personnel**

3. Coster, John K., and Sue J. King. **Conference of Vocational Education Personnel Development Coordinators**

4. Drewes, Donald W. **A Planning System for the Implementation of Section 553, Education Professions Development Act, in State Agencies for Vocational Education**

5. Klein, Gerald. **A Suggested Procedure of Preparing Budget Notes and Contractual Agreements for Projects Funded Under EPDA, Part F** OUT OF PRINT

6. Shook, Mollie W., editor. **A Preliminary Survey of Professional Development Programs Funded Under Section 553, Education Professions Development Act**

7. Cochran, Leslie H., and Richard M. Libby, editors. **The Place of Industrial Arts in Career Education**

8. Robb, Felix C. **Education—1985**

9. Klein, Gerald. **State-Level Management Techniques and Procedures for Implementing Projects Under EPDA, Part F, Section 553**

10. Pucinski, Roman. **Everything You Always Wanted to Know About the National Legislature but . . .** OUT OF PRINT

11. Hampson, David H. **Educational Product Development and Evaluation**

12. Shook, Mollie W., and Sue J. King, editors. **National Invitational Conference on Occupational Education for Chief State School Officers**

13. Coster, John K., editor. **Vocational Education—1985**

14. Porter, G. William, and John K. Coster. **Career Education Professional Development in Six Selected States**

15. Coster, John K., G. William Porter, and William L. Ballenger. **An Analysis of Definitions of Career Education**

16. Ellis, Mary L., editor. **Women at Work**

17. Coster, John K. **Anatomy of an Act in Action: System Change in Vocational Education Personnel Development**

18. Drewes, D. W., J. T. Nerden, J. E. S. Lawrence, and E. H. Oglesby. **Questions in Vocational Education**